

UC-NRLF



B 3 575 765

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

Strassburg Univ.

Accession

99688

Class

93-4
D 12



THOMAS DE QUINCEY'S RELATION TO GERMAN LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY.

INAUGURAL-DISSERTATION

ZUR

ERLANGUNG DER PHILOSOPHISCHEN DOCTORWÜRDE

AN DER

KAISER-WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT STRASSBURG

VORGELEGT VON

WILLIAM A. DUNN



STRASSBURG

UNIVERSITÄTS-BUCHDRUCKEREI VON J. H. ED. HEITZ (HEITZ & MÜNDEL)

1900.

TO MY FATHER AND MOTHER.



CONTENTS.

I. De Quincey's Study of German Literature	4
II. The Personality of De Quincey	11
III. De Quincey's View of German Culture and his Criticism of the General Literature of Germany	18
IV. De Quincey as Translator	32
V. Lessing	36
VI. Herder	42
VII. Goethe	44
VIII. Schiller	63
IX. Kant	66
X. Jean Paul	84
XI. The "Luise" of Voss	101
XII. German Romance:	
1. "Walladmor"	102
2. Tieck's "Liebeszauber"	109
3. Other German Stories	110
XIII. Conclusion	113
Appendix I	120
Appendix II	124

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey. New and enlarged edition. Edited by David Masson. Edinburgh 1889—90. 14 vols. (Quoted: Works.)

The Uncollected Writings of Thomas De Quincey, with a preface and annotations by James Hogg. London 1890. 2 Vols.

The Posthumous Works of Thomas De Quincey. Edited from the original MSS., with introductions and notes, by Alexander H. Japp. London 1891—93. 2 Vols.

De Quincey Memorials. Being letters and other records, here first published. With communications from Coleridge, the Wordsworths, Hannah More, Professor Wilson, and others. Edited, with introduction, notes, and narrative, by Alexander H. Japp. London 1891. 2 Vols.

Thomas De Quincey; his life and writings. With unpublished correspondence. By H. A. Page. London 1877. 2 Vols.

De Quincey (in English Men of Letters). By David Masson. London 1881.

De Quincey and his Friends. Personal recollections, souvenirs and anecdotes of Thomas De Quincey, his friends and associates. Written and collected by James Hogg. London 1895.

London Magazine, 1821—1824.

Blackwood's Magazine, 1826—1849.

Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, 1834—1851.

Hogg's Instructor and *Titan*, 1850—1858.

All others works mentioned are given in the foot notes.



PREFACE.

It is hoped that the following paper will be some contribution to an understanding of the relations between English and German literature, though its main purpose is to determine some features in the intellectual character of De Quincey.

I have not been able to trace all of De Quincey's references. He often fails to mention a book from which he quotes, and many times even the name of the author is not given. References marked (?) are doubtful. There are a few peculiarities in spelling in the quotations from De Quincey.

I wish to express my thanks for valuable suggestions to Professors Martin and Ziegler and Dr. Robertson of Strassburg, and to Herr Th. Knorr for assistance in identifying the quotations from Jean Paul.

To Professor Koeppel especially I owe much of the material presented, and for his never-failing encouragement and personal kindness I can not be too grateful.



I. DE QUINCEY'S STUDY OF GERMAN LITERATURE.

Perhaps no period in De Quincey's life was so significant as the years between his escape from school and his entrance into Oxford. He has described it at length in the *Confessions* — his wanderings in Wales, his lonely life in the London streets, the money-lender and the beggar-girl, the melancholy history of Ann. From that time came his knowledge of the world, the full development of his human sympathies, and most of the experiences which in his later life lived again in dreams and visions. In those years his opinions and his character took form.

At this time, too, De Quincey made his first acquaintance with German literature. It was during his tramp about Wales in the summer of 1802, when he was seventeen years old. He had run away from school and was living a roaming life among the hills, sleeping in the fields, or, when the nights were cold, in peasants' houses or the cheaper inns. Among the tourists in the region he met a young German, named de Haren, who had held a commission in the British navy. From him De Quincey learned of Jean Paul, Hamann and Hippel; but as the two were together only a few weeks, De



I. DE QUINCEY'S STUDY OF GERMAN LITERATURE.

Perhaps no period in De Quincey's life was so significant as the years between his escape from school and his entrance into Oxford. He has described it at length in the *Confessions* — his wanderings in Wales, his lonely life in the London streets, the money-lender and the beggar-girl, the melancholy history of Ann. From that time came his knowledge of the world, the full development of his human sympathies, and most of the experiences which in his later life lived again in dreams and visions. In those years his opinions and his character took form.

At this time, too, De Quincey made his first acquaintance with German literature. It was during his tramp about Wales in the summer of 1802, when he was seventeen years old. He had run away from school and was living a roaming life among the hills, sleeping in the fields, or, when the nights were cold, in peasants' houses or the cheaper inns. Among the tourists in the region he met a young German, named de Haren, who had held a commission in the British navy. From him De Quincey learned of Jean Paul, Hamann and Hippel; but as the two were together only a few weeks, De

Quincey could not have gone far in his study of the language. Three years later in Oxford, he began it in earnest; he had apparently a tutor from Dresden;¹ he devoted himself to a German, named Schwartzburg,² and in a short time was in the depths of Kant and other German writers. In his most characteristic style De Quincey describes his first impression: —

"It was a banner broad unfurl'd,
The picture of that western world."

These, or words like these, in which Wordsworth conveys the sudden apocalypse, as by an apparition, to an ardent and sympathizing spirit, of the stupendous world of America, rising, at once, like an exhalation, with all its shadowy forests, its endless savannas, and its pomp of solitary waters — well and truly might I have applied to my first launching upon that vast billowy ocean of the German literature. A banner it was, indeed, to me of miraculous promise, and suddenly unfurled. It seemed, in those days, an El Dorado as true and undeviating as it was evidently inexhaustible".³

From that time until 1812 De Quincey was reading German philosophy, particularly the works of Kant, Fichte and Schelling; "My library", he writes, "was rich in the wickedest of German speculations".⁴ For some years after his mind was under the influence of opium; but in 1816 he was again able to read Kant with enjoyment and to return to the German theology, which, he says in 1852, "I studied at my peril thirty or forty years

¹ Works II, 84.

² De Quincey and his Friends, 108.

³ Works II, 84 f.

⁴ ib. XI, 370.

ago".¹ Leigh Hunt found him later in his London lodgings "in the midst of a German Ocean of Literature".² His favorite authors were always Jean Paul, Schiller and Kant. But his mind ranged over the whole field of German intellectual activity, and he became more or less familiar not only with poetry, pure literature, and metaphysics, but with theological and Biblical criticism, with German contributions to classical scholarship and ancient history, and even with German claims in Medicine and Mathematics.³

In 1821 De Quincey began his literary career with the celebrated *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* in *The London Magazine*. Shortly afterwards appeared a series of translations from the German, and from that time for thirty years German literature was one of his favorite themes.

From De Quincey, as from Carlyle, it is easy to gain the impression that England had no interest in German literature. But that is far from the truth.⁴ To be sure, German

¹ De Quincey and his Friends, 224.

² Page's Life I, 232.

³ See Appendix II.

⁴ cf. Perry; German Influence in English Literature Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 40, 129 (1877). — A. Brandl; Die Aufnahme von Goethe's Jugendwerken in England. Goethe-Jahrbuch, III, 27 ff. — A. Brandl; Lenore in England. In Erich Schmidt's Charakteristiken, Berlin 1886, 244 ff. — R. G. Alford; Goethe's Earliest Critics in England. In Publications of the English Goethe-Society, London 1893, No. VII, 8 ff. — H. W. Singer; Einige englische Urtheile über die Dramen deutscher Klassiker. In Studien zur Litteraturgeschichte. Michael Bernays gewidmet von Schülern und Freunden. Hamburg und Leipzig 1893, 1 ff. — Th. Süptle; Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur in England im letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts. In Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte. Nene Folge, Bd. 6, 1893, 305 ff. — W. Streuli; Thomas Carlyle als Vermittler deutscher Litteratur und deutschen Geistes. Zürich 1895, 6 ff.

literature did not find the sympathetic interest that English literature found in Germany; but there was nevertheless in the second part of the century a great number of translations and reviews. Before 1800 most of the important works of German literature had appeared in English. The *Messias*, although warmly praised, was not received with general enthusiasm; the comparison with Milton was inevitable. The plays of Lessing were translated; some of them were performed, one even with success; but Lessing, too, seems to have made no lasting impression. Even *Nathan der Weise* was criticised bitterly for its freedom and tolerance. Wieland was especially favored by the translators; but the literary public and the religious public of England were perhaps more nearly synonymous then than now; at all events many took offence at Wieland. *Werther* was popular; it was repeatedly translated, dramatized and imitated. The fame of the book is curiously shown in Crabbe's *Parish Register*. He is describing a cottage in the country:

"Fair prints along the paper'd wall are spread;
There, Werter sees the sportive children fed,
And Charlotte, here, bewails her lover dead".¹

Goethe's plays were also known in England. *Iphigenie* had been translated by Wm. Taylor of Norwich, who of all the early students of German literature, had the least prejudice and the broadest acquaintance with his subject. One of the versions of *Götz* was from no

— G. Herzfeld; William Taylor von Norwich. Eine Studie über den Einfluss der neueren deutschen Litteratur in England. Halle, 1897.
— H. Kraeger; Carlyle's deutsches Studium und "Wotton Reinfred". Anglia, Beiblatt IX, 193 ff.

¹ Poetical Works of the Rev. George Crabbe: With his letters, journals and life, by his son. London 1834. 8 Vols. Vol. II, 190.

less a hand than Scott's. From both there were renderings of Bürger's *Lenore*. Schiller's early dramas had all appeared in English. *Wallenstein* in the opening year of the century found a worthy translator in Coleridge. Herder was known by the *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*. Kant, however, was as yet a name. With the masterpieces of German literature there were many of less merit, now almost forgotten. One is surprised to find, for example, Bodmer's *Noah*, Haller's *Usong*, the letters of Rabener, Gellert's *Leben der schwedischen Gräfin G.*

Most of the translations were without merit; some of them were not even based on the originals; to a few of the translators it was evidently a matter of pride, that they had worked directly from the German. The taste of the people, too, seems at this day strange enough. Gessner's *Idylls* ran through a score of editions and was rivalled in popularity only by Kotzebue's plays. The melodramatic and sentimental were the qualities which appealed to the public.

There was, however, a noticeable decline in the popular interest after the beginning of the century, and the prejudice of the religious classes became, if any thing, more decided. Yet there were still numerous books imported and there was no lack of criticisms and reviews.¹

¹ Articles from 1800—1823, The *European Magazine* has a translation of a German ballad, Jan. 1801; Articles on Kotzebue, June 1802; Gessner, Aug. 1802; Kant, Oct. 1805.

The *Quarterly Review* (founded 1809). Goethe's *Farbenlehre*, Jan. 1814; A. W. Schlegel's *Cours de Littérature Dramatique*. Traduit d'Allemand, Oct. 1814; F. Schlegel's *Lectures on the History of Literature*, April 1819.

The *Edinburgh Review* (founded 1802). Kant, Jan. 1803; Lichtenberg's *Vermischte Schriften*, Jan. 1804; Kotzebue's *Travels*, Oct.

Maria Stuart and *Hermann und Dorothea* were translated in 1801. An adapted version of *Kabale und Liebe* was performed on the stage in 1803. In 1805 Taylor published a poetical version of *Nathan der Weise*. The first rendering of Jean Paul into English was made by Henry Crabb Robinson in a translation of *Anatonda* from the German of Anton Wall.¹

The opinions expressed in the reviews are often so random or shallow, so prejudiced or so indiscriminately enthusiastic, and so completely at variance, even in the most important matters, that it is clear how far from a real understanding of German literature the English educated public was. A few examples will suffice to show the chaotic state of opinion from the beginning of this century until De Quincey began to write. The *Quarterly*

1804; Jan. 1806; *Nathan der Weise*, April 1806; *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*. By A. W. Schlegel. Feb. 1816. *Aus meinem Leben* June 1816; March 1817.

Blackwood's Magazine (founded 1817). Translations from Klopstock, June, July 1817; July 1818; from Krummacher, June 1817; from Herder, Sept. 1817; from Stolberg, Feb. 1818; from Schiller, May, July, Nov. 1818. Jan. 1819; from Körner, July 1818, May 1819, March 1821, Nov. 1822; from Böttger's *Sabina*, Oct., Nov. 1818; from F. Schlegel, Dec. 1818; from Goethe, Jan., March 1819; from Bürger, Jan. 1819; from Haller, May 1819; from Rückert, Jan. 1822.

Articles on Schlegel's *Hist. of Lit.*, Aug. 1818; A. W. Schlegel's *Observations on the Provencal Language and Literature*, Dec. 1818; Müllner's *Guilt, or the Anniversary*, Nov. 1819; *Twenty-ninth of February*, Jan. 1820; *Albanserin*, Aug. 1822; *Grillparzer's Ancestress*, Dec. 1819; *King Yngurd*, July, Aug. 1820; *Baroness Fouque's Cypress Crown*, Feb. 1820; *Goethe's Faust*, June 1820; *Körner's Rosamunda*, Oct. 1820; *Prof. Raupach's Darkness, or the Venetian Conspiracy*, Jan. 1821; *Schlenkert's Rudolph of Habsburgh*, Jan. 1822; *Kotzebue's Voyage*, May 1822; *Von Houvald's Light-tower*, a tragedy, Jan. 1823; *Klingemann's Faust*, June 1823; *Wallenstein*, translated by Coleridge, Oct. 1823.

¹ H. C. Robinson's *Diary*, Edited by Sadler. 3 Vols. London 1869; Vol. I, 360.

(Jan. 1814) in a review of Madame de Staël's *l'Allemagne* writes enthusiastically; "From these *Diis minorum gentium* (Haller, Gessner) we turn with delight to the mighty names of Klopstock, Schiller and Goethe, a triumvirate which no country perhaps, except our own, can equal, and of whose splendors even the outermost skirts are as yet but imperfectly known by the English reader". There is nothing but contempt for Kotzebue. Lessing's influence is described as follows: "The early compositions of Schiller are in a sort of bombastic prose which the influence of Lessing had made popular in Germany". In a later number of the same Review (Oct. 1814) Schiller receives very divided praise and Schlegel's *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur* is called "a remarkable work". In the *Edinburgh* (Jan. 1804) there is the following piece of criticism: "The name of Lessing, revered by every well-educated German, became almost as familiar (in England) as that of Addison or Fielding, and paved the way for the less respectable works of Schiller, Kotzebue and Iffland.... Schiller unquestionably a man of uncommon genius, is the avowed model of those poets, novelists and playwrights, who, without any genius at all, have succeeded in captivating the public attention, by an engaging display of furious lovers, frantic heroines, blasphemers, fatalists and anarchists of every description". In connection with *Nathan* the same Review says (April 1806): "We have now exhibited enough, we conceive, of this drama, to satisfy the greater part of our readers, that, in spite of some late alarming symptoms, there is good reason for holding, that there is still a considerable difference between the national taste of Germany and this country". The prejudice and commonness of English criticism reached its lowest, perhaps, in

the review of *Aus meinem Leben* (June 1816 and March 1817). "With the single exception of Schiller they (the Germans) have no writer of chaste or elegant prose." The review speaks of the "mingled rant and sickliness of German literature" and revels in such language as the following: "A German sentimentalist is a great, fat butcher whimpering over a murdered calf." The attitude of the reviews and would-be men of taste was, for the most part, smart and cheaply condescending. The *Anti-Jacobin Review* was perhaps the most extreme; the *Monthly Review* in which Taylor's criticisms appeared, the most friendly. The *Anti-Jacobin* is filled with ignorance and brutality, mixed with a canting tone. It reviles Germany as the country of atheists and loose morals. One example will suffice to show the extent of its ignorance: it inveighs against Fichte's moral sense. Even among men of genuine culture there was little lasting interest in German literature; nor were the great writers free from a certain suspicion and a certain superiority. It may be humorous treatment of the language or the people; it may be parody, as in Frère and Canning's *The Rovers*; it may be the pure ignorance and self-sufficiency of the *Anti-Jacobin* or the *Edinburgh Review*; it may be uneasiness on religious grounds, as in the feeling of Coleridge and Wordsworth toward Goethe; but the tone is in some form or other there.

It is among those who represented what is best and strongest in the English character that this last feeling is most apparent. A letter of Edward Irving's to Carlyle in connection with Jane Welsh's German studies shows it in a remarkable degree. "The books", he writes, "may not be what they are reported of. At the same time I am daily becoming more convinced that in all the literature

of our own which, it is said, holds of the German school, there is something most poisonous to all that in this country has been named virtue, and still more to the distinctions of conduct which religion makes"; and again, "I don't think it will much mend the matter when you get her introduced to von Schiller and von Goethe and your other nobles of German literature. I fear Jane has dipped too deep into that spring already, so that unless some more solid food be afforded I fear she will escape altogether out of the region of my sympathies and the sympathies of honest, home-bred men".¹ This is amusing enough. But it was not insincerity; it was the real feeling of a large body of the English people.

Of the men writing at that time, only Coleridge and Southey would have carried authority. But Southey had no interest in German literature and Coleridge was intellectually dead; so that De Quincey had no worthy competitor except Carlyle. One can easily understand therefore, how his voice might have weight; that as Carlyle says, he "passed for a mighty seer in such things".² The two had a large field before them, unexplored yet by English readers. Richter, Herder, Kant, the Romanticists were almost mere names; and for De Quincey at least, there was German research to reveal to his countrymen. We find therefore among his writings a score of essays and translations,³ of every type, drawn from all sources and written in all moods and styles. Many of these papers show the same remark-

¹ J. A. Froude; Thomas Carlyle. A History of the First Forty Years of his Life. 1795—1835. 2 Vols. London 1882. Vol. I, 135.

² Froude, Early Life I, 396.

³ See Appendix I.

able mastery of facts as the essay called *The Caesars*, which, De Quincey assures us, was written without a reference. It may not be absolutely scholarly; but the mere knowledge there, gathered from every source, the minuteness of his information, the power of combination is nothing short of marvelous, when we consider that the whole was a feat of memory. Many of these German studies, too, were written in haste and with no books at hand, for the journals and reviews. Under these circumstances it would be manifestly unfair to judge them in the strictest way. Most of them make no pretensions to scholarship; they are confessedly popular. They are the “Tummel-Platz” for all De Quincey’s hobbies and humors; much is mere whim and caprice, and momentary opinion; often he does not rise above the level of literary gossip. Yet there is, perhaps, material enough to decide many questions in connection with De Quincey. He has been the subject of much indiscriminate praise and blame; he has been called a great scholar; he was in his time, among certain classes, somewhat famous in philosophy and metaphysics; he has been celebrated for the truth of his literary instinct and has passed as a “great seer” in many things. A study of these essays may add little or nothing to our appreciation of German literature, but it may perhaps fix more clearly the literary character of De Quincey himself.

II. THE PERSONALITY OF DE QUINCEY.

To understand De Quincey's judgments of German literature, we must consider his character and education ; we must in a measure understand his mind.

De Quincey describes himself as one whose tastes and pleasures had been from youth up intellectual. So they were in a high sense ; nor were they merely literary. Political Economy at one time roused his mind from the stupor of opium. He had a profound interest in pure philosophy and history, in curious scholarship of many kinds, in theology and matters of state ; his tastes were wellnigh universal. His mind was also singularly inventive ; he had a remarkable power of memory and rapid combination ; in his own words "a logical instinct for feeling in a moment the secret analogies or parallelisms that connected things else apparently remote".¹ Yet his talent was in no considerable sense creative ; his learning various as it was, had no principle of organization ; the philosophical work, which he once planned, as well as the *Prolegomena to all Future Systems of Political Economy* remained a fragment. He possessed further a peculiar keenness of analysis and the skill of an exact

¹ Works III, 332.

✓ logician ; but it savors often of mere intellectual shrewdness. Carlyle named it "wire drawn". Yet in the most mechanical processes of his mind there is often something fantastic and volatile ; often in the exercises of the pure intellect, he yields to the play of his humor and caprice ; although, as in his *Logic of Political Economy*, he can be purely systematic, there is something uncertain in his talent ; he turns with such facility to any subject — from gold-hunting in California to the Homeric question, from *Murder as a Fine Art* to the *Philosophy of History*. Taken as a whole his work gives the impression of a brilliant mind at play, delighting in a kind of intellectual gymnastic. He calls himself a "philosophical voluptuary";¹ and there is something in the remark. With all his universal interest and curiosity, De Quincey works not so much to accomplish as to feel his mind alive. He requires intellectual activity as a nervous physical organization requires motion ; but it is rarely a fixed and certain process, and always far more a receptive than a creative one ; he is interested, he is stimulated by new ideas from without ; he loves his own meditation ; but his first impulse is not to compose and create. Further, except in purely theoretical or speculative questions, De Quincey is impatient of scepticism ; it is a necessity of his nature to believe. It is difficult for him, therefore, to treat many questions dispassionately, to see them apart from his own hopes and desires. In fact, although De Quincey was a constant student and had read so much, although his intellectual interests were so wide,

¹ Works VIII, 245. cf. Masson's Life, p. 136; 'His main interest in life was that of universal curiosity, sheer inquisitiveness and meditativeness about all things whatsoever'.

✓ his mental *sympathies* were far narrower. Dr. Johnson was in some respects no more hampered by tradition and education than De Quincey. He could never escape from the prejudices of church or party and the rooted conventions of England ; and thus, although he apprehends new ideas so quickly, he refuses or fears to accept them in their full significance. Though all interest him, he can form no new standard of judgment. For this reason he did not feel the agitation of the new movement as most of his contemporaries did. Southey and Wordsworth even, staid and conservative as they afterwards became, were deeply stirred by the hopes of the French Revolution ; Byron and Shelley were its literary expression in England. But to De Quincey its whole idea was absolutely strange ; the trend of his mind had been fixed very early ; his whole attitude toward society was the product of an older time. As a consequence there is little development in De Quincey's thought.¹ His faculties do not even seem to sharpen. He accumulates great stores of knowledge, but they do not in a corresponding measure expand his view. He looks at many things, but the measure of his eye remains the same.

De Quincey's deepest interest was for pure literature and he was particularly sensitive to the beauty of certain kinds of poetry and style. His tastes were classical and English. For the French literature, especially for the French drama he had little sympathy. The English poetry he regarded as finer than any other. In the Greek literature he cared especially for the tragic drama and there most of all for the *Antigone*. He liked the simple and

¹ S. H. Hodgson, *On the Genius of De Quincey in De Quincey and his Friends*, p. 356.

austere in English poetry, Wordsworth for example, the grandeur and pomp of Milton's verse, and the same qualities in the prose of Jeremy Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne. Apart from the beauty of form which he found in these last three authors, he delighted in the peculiar quality of their imagination. The exaltation of the emotions, the continued suggestion of meanings and feelings far remote, the gradual lifting of the whole mind into a sense of sublimity, vastness and awe — this he enjoyed perhaps more than anything else in poetry.

We have seen the impression made upon him by Wordsworth's couplet: —

"It was a banner broad unfurl'd,
The picture of that western world."

But perhaps this feeling reaches its highest expression in his description of the Greek drama,¹ which he compares to sculpture. "What we read in sculpture is not absolutely death, but still less is it the fullness of life. We read there the abstraction of a life that reposes, the sublimity of a life that aspires, the solemnity of a life that is thrown to an infinite distance. . . . It affects us profoundly, but not by agitation. Now, on the other hand, the breathing life — life kindling, trembling, palpitating — that life which speaks to us in painting, this is also the life that speaks to us in English tragedy. . . . Even the catastrophes how different! In the Greek we see a breathless waiting for the doom that cannot be evaded, — a waiting, as it were, for the last shock of an earthquake, or the inexorable rising of a deluge; in the English it is like a midnight of shipwreck from which up to the last and till the final ruin comes, there still survives the

¹ Works X, 375.

sort of hope that clings to human energies." The single phrase, "the solemnity of a life that is thrown to an infinite distance", shows perfectly the way a thing affects De Quincey; it is a mere abstraction; but it has the vividness of actual sensation; it has form and perspective and the clearness of vision.

It is in this realm of pure imagination that De Quincey's appreciation is most vivid and characteristic; but it would be unfair to deny other tastes to De Quincey; for although his mind was first of all philosophical and literary, he did not always conceive a thing in a purely logical or imaginative way. Scholar though he was, with all his love for the esoteric and curious, with all his pleasure in pure logical effects, he had always something of the practical nature of his countrymen, their impatience of that which is removed from the broad channels of human interest. No one thing in literary history had so deeply impressed him as the moral grandeur of Milton. He was always looking for it elsewhere, and measuring other things by it. His natural sympathies too, were strong; the deep feelings which belong to all men were by no means dulled in him; his heart was simple as a child's. He was fond of Chaucer, and valued his sentiment more than that of Homer; he recognized instinctively the sincerity and truth of Wordsworth's early poems; and all that was deepest in his own sympathies and thoughts, enriched by the full wealth of his imagination, found expression in his memories of Ann, the girl of the London streets. And yet, all in all, we feel that the rhetorical faculty is De Quincey's distinctive trait. He is primarily a man of letters; indeed, he concerns himself so often with merely rhetorical questions, with delicate distinctions and refinements of style;

his instinct is so keen for rare beauty of form and rhythm, for the effect upon the purely imaginative sense, that he seems often a mere literary connoisseur. He is far more than that; his intellectual tastes are in the highest degree manly and sound; and yet, most great literature has a deeper value than he gives it. The distinction, for example, between the "Literature of Knowledge" and the "Literature of Power"¹ is in almost the highest degree valuable; but a criticism that deals almost exclusively with such questions, that has little feeling for the great natural causes beneath a literary movement, that is concerned, in short, with anything less than the essential significance and vital human character of it, lacks the highest quality. De Quincey was toward few poets so sympathetic as toward Wordsworth. Yet in his essay, *William Wordsworth*,² he busies himself with Wordsworth's good fortune in money matters and the description of the poet is little more than pleasant gossip. It is only fair to say that the paper pretends to little more. Yet when he takes up in another essay³ the work of Wordsworth, he is concerned for the most part with the following: Wordsworth's diction; the question whether or not Wordsworth deals with the subjects of joy and grief; the politics of the Wanderer in the *Excursion*; an analysis of the defects in the plan of that poem; and Wordsworth's observation of clouds and twilight. A single paragraph describes the deeper character of Wordsworth.⁴

¹ Works XI, 54 ff.

² Works II, 229 ff.

³ *On Wordsworth's Poetry*. Ib. XI, 294 ff.

⁴ Perhaps the best examples of De Quincey's criticism are the papers on *Theory of Greek Tragedy* (X, 342 ff.) and *The Antigone of*

One sees constantly this capriciousness in the selection of facts and examples. De Quincey is easily attracted by the fantastic or mysterious, by anything whimsical or peculiar. Sometimes he descends even to a petty strain, as when he says of Plato, "This sentence of exile against the poets we can not but secretly trace to the jealousy of Plato".¹ With De Quincey's evident simplicity of character in many ways, and his severe reverence for truth, it is unfortunate that he is so ready to suspect the purposes of anyone. He questions the sincerity of Plato and accuses Kant of the most cringing hypocrisy.

It is plain that from such a mind we are not to expect the highest kind of interest in a foreign literature. De Quincey's work will have no such significance, for example, as that of Carlyle, not merely because his nature was intrinsically smaller, but because his interest was not so vital. Carlyle found in German literature the answers to questions that he had striven with all his powers to solve; what he writes of Goethe or of Novalis has thus the truth of actual experience. De Quincey's attitude is far more that of the professional student and man of letters. He watches the literary agitation of Germany with the greatest interest; yet of the profound character of the movement, of the significance of the ideas which were stirring there, of the efforts of mind and spirit that culminated in *Faust*, De Quincey has no suspicion.² He has answered those questions in his own way; his thoughts have already taken form.

Sophocles (X, 360 ff.). Parts of these deal with formal or secondary matters, but at times they are far more.

¹ Works VIII, 60.

² As an example of De Quincey's lack of insight cf. Works IV, 396 ff.

III. DE QUINCEY'S VIEW OF GERMAN CULTURE AND HIS CRITICISM OF THE GENERAL LITERATURE OF GERMANY.

It is impossible in studying De Quincey's view of German culture not to recognize traces of the prejudice and condescension with which, at that time, even the best English opinion often approached anything foreign. De Quincey knew German literature much too well to hold it in contempt. But he is first of all an Englishman; he admires vehemently all that Englishmen admire in character and manners; it is impossible for him to be in sympathy with much in a foreign society, and he approaches it now and then with an air of superiority. One feels that De Quincey often judges things too readily, with too much offhand facility; that he has never seriously attempted to escape from his native sympathies and training. In reading him, one must always remember too his love of pointed and witty effect, the pleasure he has in whimsical exaggeration, in following the caprice and humor of the moment. There is much therefore of purely momentary interest, which does not at all express his real critical view; much too is of the most fragmentary and trivial character and rests on no surer ground than opinion.

The literature of Germany was for De Quincey, to use his own distinction, a literature of knowledge rather than one of power. "The German literature is at this time", he writes (1819—20), "beyond all question, for science and philosophy, so called, the wealthiest in the world".¹ The strength of the German mind is not to be sought in its poetry.² "Poetry apart", he writes, "the *current* literature of Germany appears to me by much the best in Europe: what weighs most with me is the promise and assurance of future excellence, held out by the originality and masculine strength of thought which has moulded the German mind since the time of Kant".³ Yet, though De Quincey was so much impressed with the energy of the German mind and the variety and boldness of German speculation, he did not grasp the development of the new philosophy as a whole; he did not see it in its natural and necessary evolution; he did not realize the relations between its different systems. He writes of "the endless freaks in philosophy of modern Germany, where the sceptre of mutability gathers more trophies in a year, than elsewhere in a century; the anarchy of dreams presides in her philosophy".⁴ This is especially true of German theology. It is a complete chaos, subject to all impulses, with no court of appeal; valuable for its exactness in philological research, but far below the English in real constructive power.⁵ Yet it must have produced a strong effect upon him, for late in life he

¹ Page's Life I, 212.

² Works XI, 156.

³ Ib. XI, 261 f.

⁴ Works II, 202.

⁵ Ib. IV, 325 f., note.

refers to it, as something which he studied "at his peril" thirty or forty years before.¹

From the last remark it is easy to realize De Quincey's attitude; he finds the German mind "singularly disposed to skepticism". "Amongst much that is sagacious", he writes, in connection with some of the German historians, "I feel, and I resent with disgust, a taint of falsehood diffused over these recent speculations from vulgar and counterfeit incredulity."² That is De Quincey's attitude not only to critical scholarship but also to much in German philosophy. De Quincey was in no large sense a critical mind; not merely his beliefs, but his intellectual desires had often too much influence over his judgment; how much, will be seen in his study of Kant.

✓ This skeptical tendency is, according to De Quincey, the first great vice of the German mind; the second is its lack of form; "first, vague, indeterminate conception; secondly, total lack of power to methodise and combine the parts, and indeed, generally a barbarian inaptitude for composition."³ No one subject has been touched so often by De Quincey's humor as that of German style.⁴ The effect which Kant's style produced upon his rhetorical and imaginative sensibilities almost outlived his interest in the Transcendental Philosophy. Among the many specimens of his good-natured satire we quote the following: "We doubt whether any German has written prose with grace, unless he had lived abroad (like Jacobi), or had at least cultivated a very large acquaintance with English and

¹ Page's Life I, 384.

² Works VII, 46.

³ Ib. VI, 16.

⁴ Works II, 83 ff.; X, 121 ff.; 159 ff.; 257 ff.; XI, 13.

French models. Every German regards a sentence in the light of a package, and a package not for the mail-coach but for the waggon, into which his privilege is to crowd as much as he possibly can. Having found a sentence, therefore, he next proceeds to pack it, which is effected partly by unwieldy tails and codicils, but chiefly by enormous parenthetical involutions. All qualifications, limitations, exceptions, illustrations are stuffed and violently rammed into the bowels of the principal proposition. It does not occur to him as a fault. To him it is sufficient that they are *there*.¹ "A German sentence describes an arch between the rising and the setting sun."² German poetry therefore is less difficult for a beginner than German prose. The necessities of metre impose some restraint at least on style. "Infinity, absolute infinity, is impracticable."³ With such a style the Germans have naturally no eloquence. Lessing, Herder, Jean Paul and a few others, who were familiar with foreign models, are the only Germans who have written prose with any rhetorical feeling. This lack of form and clearness is the natural defect of the German mind. Its dominant and positive qualities are its powers of research, its "originality and boldness of speculation", its "masculine austerity and precision in science".⁴ De Quincey was impressed with the sincerity and integrity of the German character; in comparison with the English, however, he finds the Germans a "docile" people.⁵ They have not the same moral energy. Germany too is weak in religious

¹ Works X, 122.

² Ib. II, 83.

³ Ib. II, 83.

⁴ Ib. X, 63.

⁵ Post. Works II, 216.

philosophy. Even practical piety is more emotional and effeminate there.¹ German sentiment is less manly and less sane; it degenerates easily into the sentimental and falsetto.² This pervades even literature. “In general, I will say, that from much observation of the German literature, I perceive a voluptuousness — an animal glow — almost a sensuality in the very intellectual sensibilities of the German, such as I find in the people of no other nation. . . . Sensuality is nowhere less tolerated, intellectual pleasures nowhere more valued. Yet, in the most intellectual of their feelings there is still a taint of luxury and animal fervor.”³ This effeminacy and what he calls “animal glow” he finds in Klopstock as compared with Milton, and his sense of it in Goethe destroys all fair criticism in dealing with the poet.

For the rest, De Quincey’s observations show an acute and curious mind, but little that is of any significance in an estimate of German culture, or in a study of De Quincey himself. Most of them are truisms as regards the history of those times. He speaks of “the torpor of German patriotism”; of the incapacity for practical politics in Germany;⁴ of the lack of a sense for public affairs; of the lack of eloquence therefore, and deliberative assemblies; of the development in selfconsciousness and national dignity at the end of the 18th. century;⁵ of the gain to scholarship and general culture from so many centres of learning; of the faults of the

¹ Works IV, 403.

² Ib. IV, 361, note. XII, 403, note. For scattered references to German customs see Appendix II.

³ Works IV, 382.

⁴ Ib. I, 402; VI, 190.

⁵ Ib. IV, 324, note.

German lecture system and “its haberdashers of knowledge, cap in hand to opulent students, servile to their caprices . . . all hating, fighting, calumniating each other, until the land is sick of its base knowledge-mongers”;¹ of the class-spirit of German society in comparison with the English; of the arrogance of the military aristocracy and the consequent contempt for any profession not directly in the service of the state;² of the pedantic character of German society and conversation, the materials of which are drawn “from the systems of a few rival professors”; of the lack of public conscience in Germany in matters of thought and feeling; for example, a *Conversations-Lexicon* would be under much more severe moral restraints in England.³

It is not difficult to recognize in these criticisms something at least of the common English feeling at that time. De Quincey judges everything from his inherited standpoint; he measures things in Germany by purely English standards. ✓

With most German authors of any significance from the time of Gottsched on, De Quincey shows some acquaintance, and with a few important exceptions, an understanding of their place and influence. To expect new information, carefully weighed opinions, philosophical or historical criticism, is obviously out of the question, any more than we could expect to find them in a clever German who had an interest in English literature, read important books as they appeared, especially those of his favorite authors, had acquaintance with current ideas in England, and reproduced them again for the reviews.

¹ Works II, 32 ff.

² Ib. II, 38.

³ Uncoll. Writ. I, 275.

Of the Middle-High German literature De Quincey seems to have known nothing. The earliest writer he mentions is Melanchthon, but he had read no one carefully before Leibnitz.¹ He makes no criticism of Leibnitz; his remarks are of the most general kind. One expression of opinion, however, may throw some light upon De Quincey's own studies. He praises the austerity of Leibnitz' mind and his devotion to the severer muses, as the one requisite for the student who would be a broad scholar as Leibnitz was. Literature, he says, has such "an uncertain and even a morbid effect upon the spirits", that its pursuit "should be combined with some analytic exercise of inevitable healthy action".²

Before Schiller De Quincey finds no characteristic expression of the German genius in any high degree. Leibnitz was in no sense typical any more than Luther or Kepler; his whole culture and influence was European. His follower, Christian Wolf, had only a systematic method; he was, moreover, too purely a scholar to create a popular literary revival. In the field of pure literature De Quincey speaks first of Opitz. He was a vigorous mind, but in no way worthy of the claims of his countrymen that he was the equal of Dryden. Under any circumstances he could not be considered a worthy expression of the German mind. With the time of Gottsched and the French influence De Quincey's closer knowledge of the literature begins. Its condition at that time he describes with his own peculiar exaggeration. It was in a state of total anarchy and "academic dulness"; it was "a base travesty of Parisian levity . . . alloyed in its transfusion with the

¹ See Appendix II for references to Leibnitz and all authors mentioned in this chapter.

² Works X, 19.

quintessence of German coarseness".¹ Its leader, Gottsched was a "mere dolt", capable at best of composing a school arithmetic. De Quincey traces this stupor, as he calls it, of the German intellect, to the academic and pedantic interests of the German universities, the artificiality and sterility of the courts, and the servility of German taste in its imitation of foreign models.² To the influence of English literature and the English press in the revival of German thought, De Quincey attributes perhaps an undue importance. "England's condition of moral sentiment, her high-toned civic elevation, her atmosphere of political feeling and popular boldness — much of these she could and did transmit, by the radiation of the press, to the very extremities of the German empire."³

From English poetry, too, came the first impulse in the new literary development. To Bodmer, who had gained some glimpses of better things from Milton and Shakespeare, De Quincey ascribes the beginning of a true taste in Germany. The man had no original power; but his sympathies were noble and his influence upon Klopstock assisted in the production of Germany's first original poetry. Of Klopstock himself De Quincey has no very high opinion. "A very *German* Milton", he loves to call him — originally a remark of Coleridge's when someone had given Klopstock that title.⁴ "If ever

¹ Works XI, 157.

² Ib. IV, 314, 423 ff.

³ Works IV, 425; X, 337. De Quincey refers in this connection to the *Luise* of Voss and other German stories in which the popular interest in English affairs is shown.

⁴ Works II, 171; IV, 380. Coleridge's Works, New-York 1884, 7 vols. III, 551 ff. "A very German Milton, I could not help muttering to myself, when the good pastor this morning told me that Klopstock was the German Milton; a very *German* Milton, indeed".

there was a good exemplification of the spurious and counterfeit in literature, seek it in *The Messiah*. Klopstock is verily and indeed the *Birmingham Milton*." As a thinker, De Quincey finds Klopstock loose and slovenly, excitable and effeminate, full of sensibility and sensuous enthusiasm, but with no force of intellect, and no sense of taste, proportion or harmony. It is with special reference to him that De Quincey speaks (see p. 22) of the voluptuousness in the very intellectual sensibilities of the German.¹ His service to German literature consists in his choice of subjects and his purity of language. With part of De Quincey's criticism it is easy to agree. Klopstock is certainly no master of form; it is true that a modern reader finds often a surfeit of mere enthusiasm and vague rapture; he is in the *Messias* no great thinker; he has none of Milton's reserve, none of Milton's skill, none of Milton's sheer picturing power. But De Quincey evidently did not appreciate the influence of Klopstock's sincerity and enthusiasm upon Germany and the impulse which he gave to those who followed him.

To Wieland De Quincey grants versatility and wit. Schlosser had compared Wieland with Swift; but apart from "a touch of the comico-cynical in his nature" De Quincey finds no resemblance; he has none of the malice of Swift, he is far more genial and playful. De Quincey knew Wieland's *Idris* and his prose; but he is thinking particularly of the *Oberon*, when he speaks of the "Greician, voluptuous and beautiful nature of Wieland". So far we can have no quarrel with De Quincey's criticism,

¹ De Quincey compares Milton's treatment of a delicate episode with Klopstock's. cf. *Paradise Lost*, Book VIII, ll. 615—620; *Messias*, end of the 15th canto. (?)

as applied perhaps to much of Wieland's work (though he had tried all styles, and belonged to all schools). But De Quincey slips too easily into superlatives; the mere manner in which he makes a statement carries with it oftentimes far too much emphasis and destroys any value that a more tempered criticism might have. Thus he writes: — “Wieland was the Voltaire of Germany, and very much more than the Voltaire; for his romantic and legendary poems are above the level of Voltaire. But, on the other hand, he was a Voltaire in sensual impurity. To work, to carry on a plot, to affect his readers by voluptuous impressions, — these were the unworthy aims of Wieland. . . . An old man corrupting his readers, attempting to corrupt them, or relying for his effect upon corruptions already effected in the purity of their affections, is a hideous object.” Whatever touch of truth there is in this judgment of Wieland, is completely eliminated for us by De Quincey's over-statement.

How little De Quincey understood the German mind, or the essential character of the literary revolution in Germany, is clear from his criticism of Bürger and Lichtenberg. Bürger he calls “a man of undoubted genius”; but he wrote too little to develop a national taste. Lichtenberg had much sagacity and extraordinary talent, — but he too was not a power. “On the other hand, Lessing was merely a man of talent, but of talent in the highest degree adapted to popularity.” De Quincey ascribes to Lessing “the largest share in the awakening of the frozen activities of the German mind”.¹ His very defects and the shallowness of his philosophy promoted his popularity.²

¹ Works IV, 428.

² Works XI, 157.

Apart from Bürger's productiveness, his genius, it seems to us, was in no sense of the kind to found a great national movement and the implied comparison between Lichtenberg and Lessing it is unnecessary to answer. It seems perfectly clear from these criticisms that De Quincey's point of view was, in some degree at least, that of the conventional literary man; he sees the development of taste, of style; he is interested in the movement almost entirely from its literary side. He does not seem to realize that it was a new effort to comprehend the world; that it was absolutely rooted in reality.

De Quincey considers that the contempt of Frederick the Great for everything German stung the German pride; at all events a more independent movement began in Germany. The writings of Euler, Lambert, Kant and Haller established the preeminence of Germany over France in the pursuit of science. There were Klopstock, Lessing, Herder, Jean Paul in pure literature; but no one fitted to impress either the popular mind of Germany or foreign peoples had arisen before Schiller. Of Schiller himself, of Goethe, Lessing and the other great men of the time, De Quincey has written at length. Here, however, we are concerned only with his study of the literature as a whole. He was acquainted with Tieck, the Schlegels and Novalis; he knew something of Arndt; he mentions Stolberg, Matthison and Friederika Brun, but in such a way that with the exception of the last¹, it is uncertain whether he had read them. He knew Fouqué's *Undine*. It is possible that he knew Jacobi. He must have read

¹ De Quincey compares Friederika Brun's *Chamounix beym Sonnenaufgange* with Coleridge's *Hymn before Sunrise in the vale of Chamounix*, much to the advantage of the latter.

Kotzebue, who had at one time been very popular in England; but he speaks of Kotzebue only in the most general way. Of the other dramatists he mentions none but Schiller and Goethe. With the later literature, with Heine, with Uhland, etc., he seems to have had no acquaintance.

The Schlegels, especially Friedrich, De Quincey had read more carefully. He was indebted to them for many of his opinions; but his respect for them, both as scholars and as men was small. They had “no acquaintance with the severer sciences”; Friedrich Schlegel was a mere “cloudspinner”; his pretensions as a philosopher, De Quincey describes as being demolished by a single footnote of Schelling’s. The scholarship of the Schlegels was often nothing but vanity and pretension; they tried to give themselves the appearance of being masters of universal knowledge, to show their fancied subtlety. Bouterwek and Friedrich Schlegel sought to exhibit themselves “as a couple of figurantes on the stage of Europe”. The former and his opposition to Kant De Quincey describes in his happiest spirit of ridicule. “At a time, when Kant possessed the national mind of Germany, he thought it would be a good speculation not to fall into the train of the philosopher, but to open a sort of chapel of dissent”. Having failed in this line, he “quitted all connexion with metaphysics; and begged to inform the public that he had opened an entirely new concern for criticism in all its branches”. In like manner De Quincey writes of Schlegel’s attempts to criticise all literatures; “Woe-begone must this man of words appear when he is alone in his study; with a frozen heart and a famished intellect; and every now and then, perhaps exclaiming with Alcibiades, ‘O ye Athenians! What a world

of hardship I endure to obtain your applause'!" He accuses Schlegel of the purest hypocrisy. When he speaks of Spinoza, Kant or Leibnitz, says De Quincey, "his sentences are always most artificially and jesuitically constructed to give him the air of being quite at his ease on the one hand, and yet, on the other to avoid committing himself by too much descent into particulars".¹ Neither of them could have read Milton at all, says De Quincey, for Bouterwek quotes a piece of prose as Bodmer's which was in reality a translation from *Paradise Lost*. Schlegel had remarked that the action of *Paradise Lost* is essentially imperfect.² Aside from the fact, says De Quincey, that the action is completed in the *Paradise Regained*, the fulfilment is made known to Adam by the Archangel even in *Paradise Lost*. That in itself completes the action. Schlegel's criticism may be unsatisfactory, but to assert on this ground that he had never read the poem is a stringent method of criticism that would make short work with many of De Quincey's papers. The readiness of De Quincey to ascribe false and petty motives, a tendency most marked in his treatment of Goethe and Kant, finds also expression here; "The Schlegels showed the haughty malignity of their ungenerous natures, in depreciating Wieland when old age had laid a freezing hand upon his energy".

In the great period of German philosophy De Quincey had read much. He knew Kant well and had some

¹ Works X, 44, note. cf. Fr. Schlegel's Werke, Wien 1822, II, 234 ff.; 303 ff. His remarks, although very general, do not justify De Quincey's criticisms.

² cf. Schlegel's Werke II, 141. Schlegel himself says that the *Paradise Regained* was intended to complete the action, but that its plan is too limited to produce a balanced and harmonious effect.

acquaintance with Fichte and Hegel; but he makes no criticism of Fichte, and only calls Hegel "the great master of the impenetrable". With the philosophy of Schelling he had a closer acquaintance; Schelling himself he calls one of the three men who have combined great analytic power with artistic sensibility. Plato and Coleridge were the other two.

We have sought to collect all the expressions of De Quincey concerning German literature that have the slightest significance. It will be seen how fragmentary they are; how little claim they can make to final criticism, to a right understanding of the movement as a whole, or even to a true and serious spirit. Before taking up De Quincey's contributions to the study of the more important German writers, it might be well to speak of De Quincey as a translator.

IV. DE QUINCEY AS TRANSLATOR.

De Quincey had a familiar and accurate knowledge of modern German although he had not studied it historically. He had read very extensively and translated much. His own papers are scattered with such words as: *einseitig*, *Schwärmerey*, *Kleinstädtigkeit*, *zermalmend*, *Brodstudium*, etc. He regarded the German as the richest of modern languages, but in no sense one for rhetoric or poetry. The German hexameter is a “wooden and cast-iron imitation”.¹ “Schiller and Goethe had a notion that the language was capable of being hammered into euphony, that is was by possibility malleable in that respect, but then only by great labour of selection and as a trick of rope-dancing ingenuity”.² It is one of the most “anti-Grecian” of languages. He had noticed the foreign element in the German of the preceding century.³ He had observed the similar derivation of a few English and German words.

We are not to judge De Quincey’s translations as finished and scholarly attempt; they were written for the maga-

¹ Post. Works II, 33.

² Works XI, 258, note.

³ Ib. XI, 64, note.

zines and make little pretence to completeness or accuracy. Let us take as an example Lessing's *Laocoön*. De Quincey's first aim is to make the article readable. The language is therefore of the freest and most idiomatic kind and aims only to give the idea. He alters at will, omits words, phrases, whole sentences and paragraphs as he thinks fit, until sometimes it is difficult to recognize the original. He recasts and enlarges the idea, inserts notes in the body of the text, heightens the style, sometimes with Latin or Greek quotations or a phrase from Milton, and often enlarges and elucidates Lessing's idea.¹ But although at times he changes the form completely, he does not distort the author's meaning. He seeks merely to condense the expression, or produce a better rhetorical effect. A few examples from the *Laocoön*: —

Lessing (IX, 11): "Das allgemeine vorzügliche Kennzeichen der griechischen Meisterstücke in der Malerey und Bildhauerkunst, setzt Herr Winkelmann in eine edle Einfalt und stille Grösse, sowohl in der Stellung als im Ausdrucke."

De Quincey (XI, 164 ff.): "What is the most prominent characteristic of the Grecian masterpieces in painting and sculpture? It will be found, according to Winkelmann, in majestic composure of attitude and expression". Here by De Quincey's omission of the word "Einfalt" we lose something very essential. But this is to be traced not to his lack of knowledge, but to his impatience, haste and love of rhetoric.

As an example of his enlargement of the idea, let

¹ cf. e. g. Works XI, 185 ff. the paragraph beginning "Dreadful, however" und Lessing's *Laocoön*, p. 55 ff., in *Lessing's Sämmtliche Schriften*; Berlin 1792, Band IX.

us take the following: Lessing (33 f.): "Jammer ward in
Betrübniss gemildert. Und wo diese Milderung nicht statt-
finden konnte, wo der Jammer ebenso verkleinernd als ent-
stellend gewesen wäre, was that da Timanthes?"

De Quincey (174): "Anguish, in like manner was
tempered into sorrow. But suppose such temperaments
to be impracticable from the circumstances, how did the
artist deliver himself from this embarrassment so as to
express a due submission to the general law of his art
(that is to say, the beautiful), and yet at the same time,
to meet the necessities of the particular case? We have
a lesson upon this point from Timanthes."

Or as perhaps the most striking example of his freedom: — Lessing (73): "Bey dem Franzosen haben wiederum die schönen Augen ihren Theil daran. Doch ich will an diese Parodie nicht mehr denken." Then in a
foot note: "De mes déguisemens que penseroit Sophie? sagt der Sohn des Achilles."

De Quincey (190): "In the French Philoctetes, how-
ever, the 'fine eyes' of beauty have their share in this
revolution: ¹ 'De mes déguisemens que penseroit Sophie?'says the son of Achilles. *What would Sophia think?*
Faugh!"

Or again for a beautifying of the style: — Lessing (151): "Es ist nur ein Augenblick ² für den Dichter,
weil dieser das Vorrecht hat, einen andern, in welchem
die Göttinn ganz Venus ist, so nahe, so genau damit zu

¹ The change of mind in Neoptolemus.

² In picturing the enraged Venus.

Compare for other striking examples of De Quincey's freedom:

D. Q. p. 174 beginning 'One critic thinks' with Lessing, p. 35.

D. Q. p. 188 beginning 'and supposing' with Lessing, p. 50. .

D. Q. p. 186 beginning 'Figure him' with Lessing, p. 62 f.

verbinden, dass wir die Venus auch in der Furie nicht aus den Augen verlieren."

De Quincey (200): "But to the poet such an attitude and action are not ill adapted: since he has it in his power to place in direct juxtaposition to this attitude of fury another more appropriate to the goddess, and carrying into the very heart of the transitory passion a sense of the calm and immortal beauty which it has for a moment been permitted to disturb."

V. DE QUINCEY AND LESSING.

In Lessing De Quincey recognizes the first powerful element in the revival of a true taste in Germany. His peculiar service was, in De Quincey's opinion, that he applied philosophy in the large sense to literature and the fine arts, and became thus the founder of a genuine criticism. He recognized the falsity of the French drama, its hostility to the Greek, the worth of Shakespeare. He was moreover the first German who wrote prose with elegance. Yet in Lessing De Quincey sees at best a man of great taste and talent, adapted to popularity, with a philosophy somewhat shallow and very fragmentary, negative not constructive.¹ The last phrase illustrates again De Quincey's categorical style of criticism. He had no complete understanding of Lessing's ideas and influence; he probably uses the term "negative philosophy" because Lessing was hostile to many beliefs, especially in religion, which De Quincey regarded as established.

Lessing's position in Germany De Quincey compares with that of Dr. Johnson in England, but his talents and intellectual interests with those of Lord Shaftesbury; Lessing's taste, however, was more comprehensive; the *Lao-*

¹ Works IV, 428 ff.; other references to Lessing. Ib. II, 83; X, 122; 159; XI, 156 ff. — (Sketch of Lessing as an introduction to De Quincey's translation of the *Laocoön*). — Post. Works II, 29.

coo De Quincey compares with Shaftesbury's *Judgement of Hercules*.¹ Summing up Lessing's intellectual pretensions De Quincey names him in Friedrich Schlegel's term, a Polyhistor, and quotes at length from Schlegel's description ² of his comprehensiveness, critical method etc.

De Quincey's knowledge of Lessing seems to have been confined to the *Laocoön* and possibly the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*.³ His direct service was the translation of the former.⁴ His aim is to produce a clear and readable article for a magazine. He makes himself therefore perfectly free with Lessing's text. He omits, especially towards the end, whole paragraphs or even sections, and prefers to state only the leading ideas and principles, omitting illustrations and explanations. He alters the chapters, makes new divisions for convenience or clearness, or to suit the condensation of the work. But these omissions are to be traced to nothing more than the necessary limits of a magazine article, and perhaps to his own natural impatience, for having once caught the drift of the book, he would be content; the details would have little interest in themselves.⁵

¹ Full title of Shaftesbury's work, *Notion of the Historical Draught or Tableture of the Judgement of Hercules*.

² Introduction to Lessing's *Gedanken und Meinungen aus dessen Schriften zusammengestellt und erläutert von Fr. Schlegel*. Leipzig 1804, I, 35 ff. De Quincey names the book *Lessing's Geist aus seinen Schriften*.

³ Post. Works II, 29. The reference does not make it certain that De Quincey knew this work.

⁴ Blackwood's Magazine, Nov. 1826, Jan. 1827. Reprinted by De Quincey, Works XI, 156 ff.

⁵ De Quincey had perhaps a finer sense than Lessing for rhetorical arrangement and effect. At least his paragraphs give often a more balanced grouping of ideas than those of Lessing. De Quincey omits the Vorrede to the *Laocoön*; § I—IV are fairly complete;

De Quincey in his notes emphasizes or differs from several points made by Lessing. Some of these remarks are only the passing suggestions of his mind. A few touch more vitally the theory of the book. Lessing explains that the Greek drama was free to represent the hero as weeping or wailing, and to show that it was not out of harmony with Greek ideals mentions Philoctetes and the dying Hercules in the *Trachiniae*. That he does not mention Prometheus De Quincey considers the act of a special pleader; in view of Prometheus and Aeschylus Lessing had no right to assume Philoctetes and Sophocles as the representative Grecian models.¹ Another note is valuable as showing De Quincey's attitude towards the Fine Arts. Lessing, speaking of the control of the Fine Arts in Greece by law, says: — “Unstreitig müssen sich die Gesetze über die Wissenschaften keine Gewalt anmassen, denn der Endzweck der Wissenschaften ist Wahrheit. Wahrheit ist der Seele nothwendig Der Endzweck der Künste hingegen ist Vergnügen, und das Vergnügen ist entbehrlich.” Some of De Quincey's objections are mere hair-splitting, the result of a partial misapprehension of Lessing's meaning.² But positively he denies

V is condensed; VI largely omitted; VII altogether; VIII—XI the body of the discussion given; XII much condensed; XIII omitted; XIV, XV only the principles stated; XVI condensed in use of examples; XVII, XVIII nothing essential omitted; XIX—XXIX omitted.

¹ Works XI, 170, note.

² Ib. XI, 172, note. “The right of the state to interfere with the Fine Arts, is asserted upon the ground that they can be dispensed with, i. e. that they are of no important use”. This, De Quincey says, is in contradiction to Lessing's next sentence. — “Also darf es allerdings von dem Gesetzgeber abhängen, welche Art von Vergnügen und in welchem Maasse er jede Art desselben verstatthen will”. Lessing means to imply the representation of legitimate pleasure as distinguished from the repulsive and degraded,

that Science is more indispensable than the Arts and that the fundamental error lies in affirming the final object of the Fine Arts to be pleasure. “Not pleasure but the sense of power and the illimitable, incarnated as it were in pleasure, is the true object of the Fine Arts; and their final purpose therefore as truly as that of Science and much more directly, the exaltation of our human nature.” De Quincey’s frequent references to the head of Memnon in the British Museum “that sublime head which wears upon its lips a smile co-extensive with all time and all space”¹ show the quality that peculiarly delighted him in Fine Art. “The shows of Nature which we feel and know to be moving, unstable, and transitory, are by these arts arrested in a single moment of their passage, and frozen as it were into a motionless immortality.”²

To Lessing’s remark that the wound of Philoctetes was more fitted for impressive representation than the internal fire which consumes Meleager, De Quincey adds that the real cause of its impressiveness (and here he shows the tendency of his mind to the grave, the vague and religious) is that the supernatural in Meleager’s case is nothing more than magic, while in Philoctetes it touches the religious sense, the truths of reason and conscience.

De Quincey has a long note on the following remark by Lessing: “Ueberhaupt war das Uebliche bei den Alten eine sehr geringschätzige Sache. Sie fühlten dass die höchste Bestimmung ihrer Kunst sie auf die völlige

and goes on to speak of the influence of the Fine Arts upon national character. Lessing’s language is here not at its clearest; but De Quincey’s fault-finding is unnecessary. The real meaning is clear enough.

¹ Works I, 41, note.

² Works XI, 178, note.

Entbehrung derselben führte. Schönheit ist diese höchste Bestimmung: Noth erfand die Kleider, und was hat die Kunst mit der Noth zu thun." As well might we say, comments De Quincey, that Art has nothing to do with architecture; apart from the art in the handling of drapery itself, the real beauty of the human figure cannot be brought out except by drapery; this is due to its adaptability to the figure; but more than that, the lines of the body are repeated in more flowing material, — hence the subtlest of all pleasures, "similitude in dissimilitude". However, this is not so true of sculpture as of painting; for in sculpture owing to the sameness of material the difference is not clearly enough perceived. But a deeper reason is that the characteristic aim of sculpture is ideality and duration; "it is more abstract and imaginative than painting" and therefore would be disturbed by anything "so frail and accidental as drapery". Moreover it is not true, says De Quincey, that the sense of necessity and absolute limitation is banished from the idea of a fine art. The freedom of a fine art is found not in the absence of restraint,¹ but in the conflict with it.

De Quincey observes in another connection that with Lessing the poetic is too frequently "nothing more than that which is clothed in a form of sensuous apprehensibility".² That is certainly not the impression one would get from Lessing's own poetry, his criticism or his poetical tastes.

De Quincey's final point against Lessing is in reference to didactic poetry.³ "Didactic poetry", says Les-

¹ Works XI, 195, note.

² Works XI, 206, note.

³ Ib. XI, 215 ff.

sing, "is in truth no poetry"; Lessing's illustration is the description of the cow in Virgil's *Georgics*, the purpose of which, according to him, was purely prosaic. There is perhaps no better example anywhere of De Quincey's ability to make distinctions. Virgil, he says, may have described the cow,

- 1, As a difficult subject, by way of a bravura.
- 2, As a familiar subject.
- 3, As an ideal, a Pandora in her species.
- 4, As a beautiful object.

Each of these points is developed with intricacy and logic. Finally, "if Lessing is right in his construction of Virgil's purpose, that would prove only that, in this instance, Virgil was wrong". Lessing means obviously poetry applied to practical teaching. But the word "didactic" had caught De Quincey's attention. "Didactic in philosophic rigour it cannot be without ceasing to be poetry But there is a didactic poetry in which a subject naturally didactic is treated in a manner, and for a purpose, not didactic to win the beauty of art from a subject in itself unpromising or repulsive; and, therefore, the final object of a didactic poet is accomplished not by the didactic aspects of his poem, but directly in spite of them". Homer's "Catalogue of the Ships" is a good example. Obviously Lessing meant didactic poetry in "the strict philosophic sense" and we see therefore no necessity for the six-page discussion.

De Quincey's criticism agrees with the main purpose of the *Laocoon*. At the same time it will be seen that he had no grasp of Lessing's complete work, his deeper influence on German culture and scholarship, and the national attitude towards art and the church.

VI. DE QUINCEY AND HERDER.

De Quincey's only contribution to the knowledge of Herder in England is one short article,¹ for the most part a translation² of certain sections from *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben Joh. Gottfrieds von Herder. Gesammelt und beschrieben von Maria Carolina von Herder. Herausgegeben durch Johann Georg Müller.*³ There is the merest possible sketch of Herder's temperament and his family life, with a single attempt at a characterization. "Upon the whole, the best notion I can give of Herder to the English reader, is to say that he is the German Coleridge; having the same all-grasping erudition, the same spirit of universal research, the same disfiguring superficiality and inaccuracy, the same indeterminateness of object, the same obscure and fanciful mysticism, the

¹ London Magazine, April 1823. Reprinted by De Quincey, Works IV, 380 ff.

² The parts which De Quincey translates describe (a) The meeting of Herder and the Elector at Dresden, Herder's Werke, Band XXII, 228 f.; (b) Herder's final illness; 234—38; (c) Remarks on Herder and Jean Paul 244—45; Jean Paul's estimate of Herder, 246—50, quoted from the last lecture in *Vorschule der Ästhetik*. There are also translations of shorter passages in the notes.

³ Herder's sämmtliche Werke, Stuttgart und Tübingen 1830, Band XX—XXII.

same plethoric fullness of thought, the same fine sense of the beautiful, and (I think) the same incapacity for dealing with simple and austere grandeur. I must add, however, that in fineness and compass of understanding, our English philosopher appears to me to have greatly the advantage."

De Quincey speaks (X, 159) of the superiority of Herder's style, to that of most German writers.

For other references to Herder, Cf. Appendix II.

VII. DE QUINCEY'S RELATION TO GOETHE.

At the time De Quincey wrote Goethe had gained no fixed position in England; and the prejudice against him, which, after a century of criticism, still exists among certain classes in Great Britain and the United States, was then far more strong.¹ The only man who could have given anything like a fair account of Goethe, until Carlyle appeared, was Wm. Taylor of Norwich. But although Taylor had a real appreciation of Goethe and a wide knowledge of his work, he never comprehended his significance. He failed entirely to understand *Faust*; it marked for him a degeneration. Goethe had been appreciated in a measure by Scott, Monk Lewis, Byron and Shelley. But Scott had done nothing to further an understanding of him since the translation of *Götz*, twenty-five years before; at best, his sympathies had never passed beyond the romantic world of that drama. Lewis had no understanding for anything more than the wilder ballads. Byron acknowledged the greatness of Goethe; Shelley had at one time thought of writing a new version of *Werther*; he had translated fragments of *Faust*; but although both

¹ For examples of the best modern English criticism of Goethe cf. J. R. Seeley, *Göthe Reviewed after Sixty Years*. Leipzig 1894; Edward Dowden, *New Studies in Literature*, London 1895, p. 142 ff.

were of a nature to sympathize with many tendencies in Goethe, neither of them had attempted a serious interpretation of him. The tone of criticism in the reviews was for the most part cheap and coarse enough. *Werther*, popular as it was, did not escape censure for its sentimentality and revolutionary tendencies; *Stella* especially, although praised in other ways, was denounced as a most immoral and disgusting work. The sins of Goethe's characters were fastened upon himself; in the eyes of the *Anti-Jacobin*, he was little better than a criminal, shameless and irresponsible, with a perverted mind. A large part of the English public looked upon Goethe as the incarnation of all that was to be avoided in the German nature, as a creature without the sense of moral responsibility, the slave of passion. In a review of Madame de Staël's work in the *Quarterly* for October 1814 there is the following criticism of *Faust*. It is "one of the most extravagant productions of ill directed though boundless genius.... That *Faustus* is a work of extraordinary merit, and displays the strongest intellect it would be a want of candour to deny, but we neither envy nor admire the talents that produced it, at the expense of feeling, morality and religion: for it not only aims at destroying all the comforts of the present life; by proving that man is destined to misery from his birth, however extensive his future, exalted his rank, or cultivated his intellect, but it tends to deprive him of the only solace that is left for his misfortune, the prospect of a blessed futurity". The *Edinburgh*, in a review of the same work (Oct. 1813), calls it the most "odious of all the works of genius"; but this Review reaches its height of ignorance and cheapness in January 1816 and March 1817, in its papers on Goethe's *Aus meinem Leben*. They are coarse and abusive

to the last degree. Yet this was not the universal attitude. Even in the preceding century there was much discriminating praise in the criticisms of Goethe's early dramas; praise for the portrayal of character and knowledge of human nature, for the reality of the feeling, the energy of imagination and invention. The *Monthly Review* had from the beginning been well-disposed toward Goethe; as early as 1793 it had spoken favorably of *Iphigenie*, and in 1798 of *Wilhelm Meister*. The *Quarterly* (Jan. 1814) calls Goethe "of all men now living the most extraordinary". It compares him, strangely enough, with Gay and Sterne; he is no dramatic poet except in *Clavigo*; *Egmont* it calls dull; *Stella* "harmlessly absurd"; *Iphigenie* "ponderous". But it speaks with high praise of *Werther*, of *Hermann and Dorothea*, and "the marvellous dramatic poem of *Faustus*". *Blackwood's* had described the attack of the *Edinburgh* as a disgrace and given Goethe great praise. The *London Magazine*, in which De Quincey began his career, had shown (Aug. 1820) a deep sympathy with *Faust*; *Blackwood's* had already called it Goethe's greatest work. There were men whose critical opinion would have carried real weight; but Southey and Coleridge had no interest in Goethe; they both preferred *Werther* to all his other works; indeed, although Goethe had been so freely translated, *Werther* alone had produced any lasting impression. Coleridge described *Faust* as vulgar, licentious and blasphemous. Wordsworth thought Goethe a poet of distinctly low rank, with no originality, but with a faculty of artistic imitation.¹ He had not been able to read *Wilhelm Meister* through. Accord-

¹ For a clear statement of Wordsworth's opinion of Goethe. cf. Perry, *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 40, p. 129.

ing to a report of a conversation with De Quincey,¹ Wordsworth regarded Goethe as little better than a quack. Wordsworth, said De Quincey, never read books, but "somehow or other *Wilhelm Meister* had fallen in his way, and he had gone through it till he came to the scene where the hero, in his mistress" bedroom, becomes sentimental over her dirty towels, etc., which struck him with such a disgust that he flung the book out of his hand and declared that surely no English lady would ever read such a book". With the exception of Byron and Shelley Goethe had made no impression on a mind capable of interpreting, even of understanding him, until Carlyle became his apostle; but their interest in him was transitory and their position in English society would have nullified any influence they might have sought to exert. Even Carlyle whose reverence for Goethe was a passion, was not altogether free from the antipathy which lay so deep in the English mind. He writes: "There is poetry in the book (*Wilhelm Meister*), and prose, prose for ever. When I read of players and their sorry pasteboard apparatus for beautifying the moral world, I render it into grammatical English with a feeling mild and charitable as that of a starving hyaena."¹ "Goethe is the greatest genius who has lived for a century, and the greatest ass who has lived for three." Or again; "Meister himself is perhaps one of the greatest *ganaches* that ever was created by quill and ink. I am going to write a fierce preface disclaiming all concern with the literary or the moral merit of the work, grounding my claims to recompense or toleration on the fact that I have accurately copied a striking portrait of Goethe's mind — the strangest,

¹ J. R. Findlay, in *De Quincey and his Friends*, 144.

and in many points the greatest, now extant. What a work! Bushels of dust and straw and feathers with here and there a diamond of the purest water.”¹

The English antagonism to Goethe De Quincey represents in its most intense form. He was not a nature to appreciate Goethe’s aim or work; his experience and his interests were far more narrow than the world revealed in *Meister*. His mind had never grappled seriously with the problems which interested Goethe. Moreover he read the book as he would have read any novel; he saw in it Goethe’s ideal world, his “pattern people”. With such expectations his feelings were perhaps natural; he received the same impression as Wordsworth; De Quincey found instead of the poetry and wisdom which Carlyle insisted were in the book, a lack of skill and interest in the narrative and an unaccountable use of unpleasant and revolting motives. With such a disposition, writing from vague and casual knowledge, seizing the first and most obvious impression, without even the original at hand, De Quincey reviewed Carlyle’s translation of *Wilhelm Meister*.²

One can scarcely imagine a more complete misunderstanding of an author’s meaning than De Quincey here exhibits; and even were his impressions perfectly true, the tone of his paper is common and vulgarly smart. Of the real drift of the book he has no suspicion. Even the warning preface of Carlyle, written with the fullest beauty and sincerity, cannot deter him from handling the novel as so much material for the reviewer, or per-

¹ Carlyle’s Early Letters, Ed. by Norton. London 1886. Vol. II, p. 223 f.

² Froude’s Early Life I, 212.

suade him that the author meant to create anything more than an amusing tale. It seems to him, aside from its dulness, (and his feelings were sincere enough) merely depraved and vicious.

The first of the two articles is an attack on the 'puffing' of Goethe's name in England and a criticism of Carlyle's translation. Goethe himself De Quincey calls 'an old vagabond'. Except for a remark on the style, for which he professes no respect,¹ his criticism of the book is found in the second paper. We shall treat this paper at length because it is typical of De Quincey's method in many cases, and will throw as much light as any other upon some of his habits of mind.

He begins boldly as an "eidoloclast", is secretly delighted that Goethe's coterie in London is so small, and expresses his pity for them. Catching his cue from a remark of Carlyle's in the preface, "Many, it is to be feared will insist on judging *Meister* by the common rule", De Quincey says that there is no rule with regard to the novel "but the golden rule of good sense and just feeling". It seems incredible that De Quincey should think Carlyle was referring to canons of art and style. But such is the case. "We cannot allow" he writes, "that our criticism shall be forestalled by any pretence that we are opposing mechanic rules which do not and cannot exist Good sense is the principle and fountain of all just composition Next, we presume, that . . . a poet stands amenable to criticism for the qualities

¹ London Magazine, vol. X, 192: "He is no great master, nor was ever reputed a master, of the idiomatic wealth of his own language". This is one of the remarks which make it seem probable that De Quincey really knew very little of Goethe at first hand.



of his sentiments and the passions he attributes to his heroes, heroines and pattern people". With these as guiding principles De Quincey arranges what he calls a "Gallery of Female Portraits", and ends with a "History of Mr. Meister's Affairs of the Heart". What his fancy and humor make out of these one can easily imagine. Philina is the "lover of all MANkind". The episodes between Wilhelm and the countess or Wilhelm and Theresa are treated as scenes in a farce or something worse. But his sense of the ludicrous finds fullest play in the description of the death of the harper. After a picture of the elaborate preparation for a German suicide, laudanum, almond-milk and what not, the critic quotes: "He raised it to his month; but he shuddered when it reached his lips; he set it down untasted; went out to walk once more across the garden. O fie, fie!" comments De Quincey, "this is sad work: 'walking across the garden' and 'shuddering' and 'doing nothing', as Macmorris (*Henry V*) says, 'when by Chrish there is work to be done and throats to be cut'." His humor runs riot in the description of Augustin's end, the elaboration of details, the long delays. "In conversing with a friend we took a bet that, for all his throat was cut, he would talk again and talk very well too His throat is cut; and still, as Macmorris would be confounded to hear, 'by Chrish there is nothing done': for a doctor mends it again (p. 283), and at p. 284 we win our bet He talks down to the very last line of p. 284; in which line, by the way, is the very last word he is known to have uttered Now then, having heard the 'last word of dying Mignonette, (so De Quincey nick-names Mignon's father) the reader fondly conceives that certainly Mignonette is dead. *Mit nichten*, as they say in Germany,

by no means. Mignonette is not dead, nor like to be for one day His throat is mended by the surgeon ; but having once conceived a German theory that it was impossible for him to live he undoes all that the doctor has done, tears away the bandages and bleeds to death Mignonette is dead, dead as a doornail we believe ; though we have still some doubts, whether he will not again be mended and reappear in some future novel We have Mr. Goethe's word for it, however, that Mignonette is dead But be that as it may, nothing is so remarkable as the extreme length of time which it took to do the trick if not the boldest, the longest suicide on record."

It was of course inevitable that De Quincey should laugh at Wilhelm's sentiment. He refuses to consider it seriously at all, — calls him a fool and passes on. He points out also the awkward machinery of the denouement, and such scenes as that in which Aurelia cuts Wilhelm's hand with the dagger, scenes that seem capricious and strained. But his deepest antipathy is for the atmosphere in which the characters move ; for this world of "passions" and "affairs of the heart", for such episodes as Wilhelm's affair with the countess, or that which caused Laertes' hatred of women. With De Quincey it goes so far that the circumstances of Mignon's birth destroy all interest in the child. He regards her history as "the most unequivocal evidence of depraved taste and defective sensibility". Goethe cannot rely, he says "on the grand high-road sensibilities of human nature ;" he is "always travelling into by-paths of unnatural and unhallowed interest, in order to rouse his own feelings, originally feeble, and long before the date of this work grown torpid from artificial excitement". This sentence

s probably the last thing one would say of Goethe. Even the names in *Wilhelm Meister* such as Jarno, and others ending in a or o, are "a sufficient evidence of Goethe's capriciousness and fantastic search after oddity".

De Quincey's review destroys itself by its very extravagance ; and yet it can hardly be thrown aside as altogether valueless. He is certainly right in some degree as regards the handling of the piece. One would hardly say that the strength of *Wilhelm Meister* lies in its management of event and incident. However clearly Goethe has conceived the characters, he often resorts to most complicated situations, and a symbolism which, in its detail and development, is far from direct or clear ; only when the whole is seen at a distance, in its largest outlines, the grandeur of its plan appears. It was perfectly natural too for De Quincey to find a lack of dignity and nobility in Goethe's treatment of passion.

But De Quincey did not see far enough. The episodes are not the purposeless things De Quincey supposed ; they are valuable in a symbolic way, in a way that De Quincey was unable to understand. The affair of the Count, the meeting with Theresa, her own strange history ; these have the greatest importance in the development of Wilhelm. But as mere events, as things in themselves, they must have seemed uncalled for to one reading the book as a novel. Incidents of this kind are almost the only means used to develop the course of the story. Whatever Goethe's richness and invention in other respects, he has conceived almost no other kind of situation ; it is easy to see how De Quincey, from his utter misunderstanding of the deeper purpose of the book, would have been repelled by it.

As a whole, however, the review is one of the

weakest pieces of criticism one could read. De Quincey treats his subject with mere contempt, with neither taste nor earnestness. Of the meaning of the scenes, whose arrangement and shifting, whose actors and dialogues he laughs over so glibly, De Quincey knows nothing. That the real harmony of the piece is an inner one, that its plan is of the intellect and spirit, he has no idea. De Quincey takes the scenes of *Wilhelm Meister* as ideal scenes, its characters, to use his own words as “pattern people”. He does not see that they were never intended to be “pattern people”; that Goethe understood their weaknesses far more truly than many of his critics have done; that the real secret of the book is the development from weakness and uncertainty to a higher freedom and knowledge.

Carlyle called De Quincey’s paper “a very vulgar and brutish review”; but it rankled in him nevertheless. Wilson in *Noctes Ambrosianae* refers to it in his usual style of raillery :

O’Doherty : “Well, the Germanic faction is getting on. Have you seen the last *London Magazine*? How bitter they are on the poor *Wilhelm Meister*.”

North : “What are they saying?”

O’Doherty : “Oh, abusing the Germans uphill and down dale.”

North : “I should have thought my friend Opium would have kept them from this particular piece of nonsense.”¹

It is the opinion of Professor Masson that De Quincey omitted the first of the two papers from his collected works, not only because he wished to avoid an attack

¹ *Blackwood’s Magazine*, Aug. 1824; the date is wrongly given by Alford as June, 1824.

upon Carlyle, but also because his own estimate of Goethe had changed. At all events there is a remarkable change of tone in his biography of Goethe written for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.¹ The spirit of this paper is more earnest and subdued; there is some attempt to give a disinterested account of Goethe's life; there is respect and even honor towards the man. But the essay has no final value. De Quincey wrote here also from slight and often second-hand knowledge. He had read *Wilhelm Meister*, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, and probably *Werther* and *Die Natürliche Tochter*. He also quotes correctly from the *Farbenlehre* and refers to the *Morphologie*.² He was of course familiar with Carlyle; he refers to opinions of the Humboldts and the Schlegels, and to Mrs. Sarah Austin's *Characteristics of Goethe*;³ but although he passes judgment upon most of Goethe's works, it is questionable if his study had gone much further.

Nowhere does the weak side of De Quincey as a critic appear more clearly. Goethe is at best a highly interesting phenomenon, to be explained by circumstances of time and fortune. De Quincey is impressed with the spectacle of Goethe's dictatorship over German literature, but Goethe is in his opinion only the professional poet of good fortune. His work is judged by the conventional standards of realism and idealism, the classical tendency, fidelity to history in the dramas, and the other measures which the professional critic applies to the professional

¹ Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works IV, 395 ff. Written in 1837 or earlier.

² Posth. Works II, 91; Works XI, 271, note.

³ Full title: *Characteristics of Goethe, from the German of Falk, von Müller, etc. With notes original and translated, illustrative of German literature.* 3 Vols. London 1833.

man of letters. The events chosen by De Quincey from *Dichtung und Wahrheit* show a strange capriciousness; the inferences he draws from them reveal the swift and facile ingenuity of his mind, but no less his ignorance of facts, his lack of insight into the real character of Goethe.

He emphasizes the description of Frankfort and Frankfort society, in which his fancy sees a resemblance to an English cathedral town, a subject which in turn gives rise to a short excursion into Political Economy. He says much of Goethe's education. He lingers characteristically on the experiment of Goethe's parents to eradicate fear from the minds of their children. He dwells on the Lisbon earthquake, Goethe's consequent skepticism, and the general shallowness of German piety. The apparently capricious choice of studies in Goethe's early education and its general desultory character lead De Quincey to remark that, of all Goethe's attainments in language, he possessed none of them to a degree which made them practically useful at the time when he went to the university. Goethe states clearly that he could converse easily in French, that, while at the university, he wrote verses in the foreign languages,¹ and that he had no difficulty with the Latin in his graduating dissertation. But De Quincey's skill in inference reaches its perfection in his notice of the coronation which took place in Frankfort in Goethe's fifteenth year. Having explained the unimpassioned manner in which the description is given by saying that "the mind of Goethe was not contemplative enough to create a value for common occurrences through any particular impressions, which he had derived from

¹ Goethe's Werke, herausgeg. v. Ludw. Geiger, Berlin 1893.
10 Bde. IX, 277.

them", he goes on to remark: "Probably the prevailing sentiment, on looking back at least to this transitory splendour of dress, processions and ceremonial forms, was one of cynical contempt. But this he could not express, as a person closely connected with a German court, without giving much and various offence. It is with some timidity that he hazards a criticism upon single parts of the costume Had Goethe felt himself at liberty can it be doubted that he would have taken his retrospect from the station of that stern revolution, which within his own time had shattered the whole imperial system of thrones". At any rate the laugh of the queen "on surveying the departing pomps of Charlemagne, must, in any contemplative ear, have rung with a sound of deep significance". In this one incident De Quincey errs in three particulars: as regards Goethe's real feelings at the time, the influence of the court upon his freedom of speech, and his feeling towards the French Revolution. But De Quincey can go even farther. "These pageants of 1763—64 occupy a considerable space in Goethe's *Memoirs* Perhaps he might feel a sort of narrow local patriotism in recalling these scenes to public notice". De Quincey might have felt such a local pride, but scarcely Goethe.

De Quincey writes at length of the sojourn of Count Thorane in the Goethe house during the invasion of the French army. He dwells on the details, the humorous picture of Goethe's father preparing his congratulations for the Prussians before a battle which the French won; the delight of the Count which overflows in sweetmeats for the children, the surliness of Herr Goethe and his subsequent arrest, the dialogue between the Count and the interpreter who pleads for the old man's forgiveness,

a dialogue “of length and dulness absolutely incredible”; we are assured therefore that probably “no such dialogue ever took place”. De Quincey mentions further, Goethe’s acquaintance with Gretchen; to his whole university life only a few lines are given. A few lines more describe the publication of *Goetz* and *Werther*. In connection with *Goetz* De Quincey notices the facts that it was translated by Scott, and that Goethe had difficulty in paying for the paper. With his connection with the House of Weimar all elaboration ends. Of the rest of Goethe’s long life De Quincey has no detailed knowledge. It is dismissed with a few pages in which his relation to the Duke is sketched truly; the only thing described at any length is Napoleon’s meeting with the Duchess after the battle of Jena, given such prominence apparently because De Quincey knew a description of that event by an Englishman well acquainted with Weimar and its court.

It will be seen that De Quincey grasps only the event, the scene, the humorous or the peculiar. The really valuable part of *Aus meinem Leben*, namely, the development of Goethe’s mind and taste, the influence which these experiences had upon his own culture, the things which Goethe valued most in his growth, his friends, his mental and moral tendencies, his inner experiences — of these De Quincey is silent. The journey to Italy is hardly mentioned; nothing is said of the friendship with Schiller. Yet these were the greatest events of Goethe’s life. The truth is that De Quincey knew nothing of Goethe’s real interests during that time.

After dismissing Goethe’s *Songs and Occasional Poems*¹

¹ De Quincey refers (Posth. Works I, 15) to the *Erlkönig* and quotes a few lines, but not exactly.

De Quincey reiterates in a calmer way his first judgment of *Wilhelm Meister*. He recognizes now the genius of the translator; but his opinion of the book has not changed. Its purpose is not clear; the comments of the Humboldts and the Schlegels have made it more cloudy still. Although it may arouse some sincere feeling in the German mind, it can gain no attention in England, for it is often "at war, not only with decorum and good taste merely, but with moral purity and the dignity of human nature". The *Wahlverwandtschaften* De Quincey merely mentions. To the dramatic works the critic is better disposed. The *Iphigenie* might stand after *Samson Agonistes* as the most faithful modern transcript from the antique. From one phrase, "if we are to believe a Schlegel, it is in beauty and effect a mere echo from the finest strains of the old Grecian music", we are doubtful whether De Quincey had really read the poem. *Clavigo* "too openly renounces the grandeur of the ideal"; — a criticism which is certainly vague enough. "The *Tasso* has been supposed to realize an Italian beauty of genial warmth and sunny repose." The words "is supposed to" make it seem probable that De Quincey had also not read *Tasso*. *Egmont* violates "historic truth of character".

Die natürliche Tochter De Quincey in all probability knew. He describes its action as slow; the situations have no scenical distress, but they are not unexciting, as most of the critics would have it; on the contrary they are "too powerfully affecting". In this criticism De Quincey is certainly correct as regards the action of the piece. But we do not understand him when he says that the scenes are powerfully affecting. Except in the final scenes the characters seem to lack free dramatic action.

Of *Faust* De Quincey has nothing to say; there is no ground for criticism, "for no two people agree as to the work".¹ *Hermann and Dorothea* leads to a fantastic remark. Because it pleased uncritical readers more than any of Goethe's other works and "from other indications of the same kind", De Quincey is "disposed to infer that Goethe mistook his destination; that his aspiring nature misled him; and that his success would have been greater had he confined himself to the *real* in domestic life, without raising his eyes to the *ideal*".

In summing up Goethe's general literary reputation De Quincey gives his assent to the verdict, that, "in the opinion of some amongst the acknowledged leaders of our own literature for the last twenty-five years, *Werther* was superior to all which followed it". Further, the reputation of Goethe must decline till it reaches its just level. Three causes have exaggerated it; Goethe's extraordinary age, his official position and "the quantity of enigmatical and unintelligible writing which he has designedly thrown into his latter works" by way of keeping himself before the public.

Towards Goethe as a man De Quincey takes in this paper a somewhat saner view. He recognizes now the healthy temperament of the poet, his self-respect, his gravity and sincerity. "At the same time, we cannot disguise from ourselves that the moral temperament of Goethe was one which demanded prosperity." Goethe was originally religious; but whether through "mere levity or wantonness of youthful power, or from the false bias growing out of the Lisbon earthquake, he falsified

¹ De Quincey's only other remark (V, 309) on *Faust* is unimportant.

his original intention", — a most striking example of the way a single fact takes possession of De Quincey's mind. One thing is certain, "Goethe had so far corrupted and clouded his natural mind, that he did not look up to God with the interest of reverence and awe, but with the interest of curiosity".

One sees at once how scattered De Quincey's criticism is, how much he writes from slight knowledge or the merest inference. But the tone of the paper at least is in every way finer than in the first; yet the real reason was not that De Quincey's opinion had changed, but because Goethe's position had become so established that it was not in good taste to indulge in mere attack.

✓ While preparing his *Selections, Grave and Gay*, probably in 1855 or 1856, De Quincey writes to ask about the proofs of *Goethe*; "There is a *personal* case of deep importance to myself depending upon it. But under *any* circumstances how could the press take upon itself to intercept my sole opportunity of dealing with a case which the lapse of twenty-five years has greatly affected."¹ The "personal case" to which De Quincey refers, was of course that of Carlyle, for they had become friends. He omitted the first number therefore with its criticisms of Carlyle.

✓ But the attack on Goethe was republished, and there is other evidence to show that his opinion had really not changed. In 1834 he expresses an unfavorable opinion² There is again a violent criticism of a German writer's claim that Goethe deserves with Shakespeare and Homer a place in the trinity of the men of genius.³ Even Goethe's

¹ Page's Life II, 39.

² cf. Works II, 225.

³ Posth. Works I, 204. This was written after 1835; for De Quincey refers in the same paragraph to Coleridge's *Table Talk* which appeared in that year.

last words are treated without any sense of the fitness of things. De Quincey describes him as dying "in the act of shouting clamorously — 'Light, I say, — More light!'"¹ In 1841, speaking of his review, he writes: "Upon the German author I was indeed severe, but hardly as much as he deserved."² In the year 1854 his old antipathy shows itself again.³ The following references are very characteristic. In describing the meeting of Goethe and Schiller with Madame de Staël, De Quincey writes: "Neither Goethe nor Schiller, though well acquainted with written French, had any command of it for purposes of rapid conversation; and Humboldt supposes that mere spite at the trouble which they found in limping after the lady so as to catch one thought that she uttered, had been the true cause of their unfavorable sentence upon her."⁴ Humboldt's account gives no ground for De Quincey's trivial criticism.⁵ "Sie (Goethe und Schiller).

¹ Works IV, 393, note.

² Works III, 174.

³ De Quincey and his Friends, p. 144.

⁴ Works X, 284.

⁵ Briefe von W. von Humboldt an eine Freundin. 2. Theil, S. 226; Leipzig 1847. For the opinions of Goethe and Schiller see a paper by Carlyle, *Schiller, Goethe and de Staël* in *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*. 6 vols. London 1869. II. 394 ff. This paper is for the most part a compilation from the Goethe-Schiller correspondence and Goethe's continuation of his *Autobiography*; their criticisms do not justify De Quincey's remark, or for that matter Humboldt's; they are written with frankness and discrimination, but with taste.

SCATTERED REFERENCES TO GOETHE.

The opinion of Goethe and Schiller as to the metrical difficulty of the German language (cf. Works X, 258, note).

The praise accorded by Goethe and Schiller's to the Greek taste in representing death as a beautiful boy (cf. Works II, 73).

kannten sie (Frau von Staël) nur aus einzelnen Gesprächen, und auch da nur unvollkommen, da sie sich doch beide nicht Französisch mit vollkommener Freiheit ausdrückten. Diese Gespräche griffen sie an, weil sie dadurch angeregt wurden, ohne sich doch in dem fremden Organ ganz und rein aussprechen zu können, und so wurde Ihnen die lästig, die solche Gespräche veranlasste."

VIII. DE QUINCEY AND SCHILLER.

De Quincey wrote in 1838 a life of Schiller for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.¹ In this, as in much of De Quincey's work, it is very difficult to formulate anything of value, not only because his treatment of the subject is so general and superficial, because he gives so little original criticism and often rises no higher than the level of the ordinary reviewer, but, most of all because, inquisitive and curious as he is, with all his love for style and beauty, he is not deeply affected by the work of Schiller. His own opinions are in no way influenced by the poet.

The greater part of the essay deals with the state of German literature before Schiller. This we have treated already in connection with De Quincey's relation to German literature as a whole. The part which relates to Schiller himself is only a few pages in length. It is a sketch like the second article on Goethe, without detail or balance, the barest possible outline of facts. The material is taken almost entirely from Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*.² To reproduce De Quincey's broken account

¹ Republished by De Quincey; cf. Works IV, 422 ff.

² How closely De Quincey followed Carlyle may be seen from these points: (1) The only things which are not already in Carlyle are a single date, and the prayer of Schiller's father, of which Car-

of the poet's life can here have no value. His criticism of the dramas too is of the most fragmentary sort. In fact nothing except *The Robbers* is treated with any detail. That criticism is for De Quincey eminently fair. It is not a new criticism; it is the common one, but nevertheless true. The characters are "mere impossibilities". They have not the internal coherence which are found even in Shakespeare's preternatural creations. As a work of art the play is "indefensible"; nevertheless there are great beauties, "terrific sublimities" existing "on that basis of the visionary". That contains in the germ the most that is to be said of Schiller's *Robbers*. But when De Quincey states that none of the subsequent dramas from *Fiesco* to *Marie Stuart* are so far free from the faults of the *Robbers* as to merit a separate notice,¹ he shows either a lack of knowledge, or the categorical style of judgment to which he often yielded too easily. In another connection, however, De Quincey speaks of the "close unity in the incidents, the personality in the moving characters, the fine dramatic contrasts" in *Fiesco*.² Upon *Wallenstein* he rests the greatness of Schiller. It is ranked as the one of all modern dramas nearest to Shakespeare; nothing in the modern English drama can be compared with it.³ One thing impresses him particularly; the

lyle gives only a phrase (cf. IV, 432 with Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*. Chapman and Hall, London 1873, p. 7). (2) Schiller's opinion of *The Robbers*, quoted by Carlyle, is given by De Quincey with changes of wording (cf. ib. p. 436, Carlyle p. 22). (3) Even Carlyle's description of Schiller's appearance is reproduced with slight changes (cf. ib. 439, Carlyle p. 223).

¹ "With less power they are almost equally licentious", is De Quincey's only criticism.

² Works VII, 369.

³ Works X, 200.

position of Max and Thekla against the dark and threatening scenes in which they move.¹ It is again noteworthy that to De Quincey the most striking thing should be this noble form of the picturesque. Certainly it is not the chief significance of *Wallenstein*. How unconsciously De Quincey betrays his love of formal beauty, of classic arrangement and repose! De Quincey speaks with admiration of Wallenstein's speech to his sister, where he describes the sense of death which hung over Henry IV. of France.² (cf. *Wallenstein's Tod*, Akt V, Sc. 4. "Der König fühlte das Gespenst des Messers, etc.") In concluding he names Schiller the greatest of German writers. No other mind commanding enough to levy the homage of foreign peoples had arisen before him; no other writer of modern Germany has the same right to reverence as a man.³ That is after all the secret of De Quincey's love for Schiller. More than any other of the German poets Schiller corresponds to De Quincey's literary idol, Milton. De Quincey found in him the same dignity and elevation, the same "nobility and aspiring grandeur", that he reverenced in the "moral king of authors".

¹ Ib. XI, 376; a note (VI, 227) shows that De Quincey knew *Wallenstein's Lager*.

De Quincey refers also (X, 452, note), 1, to Schiller's *Aesthetic Education of Men*. cf. *Über die aesthetische Erziehung des Menschen in einer Reyhe von Briefen*; 2, to his models of hexameter and pentameter; cf. Posth. Works II, 33 with Schiller's *Kleinigkeiten*; No. 96. 3, to a line by Schiller describing a cannon-ball, "shattering what it reaches and shattering that it may reach". cf. Works IX, 251. For references to Schiller in connection with Goethe see pp. 61, 62 note.

² Works VIII, 446.

³ Ib. XI, 262, 272.

IX. DE QUINCEY AND KANT.

✓ De Quincey's first study of Kant was in 1805, when he was but twenty years old. In 1812 we find him reading Kant, once more in 1814, and it is safe to say that from that time on he returned to Kant again and again. He read no other German author so closely; his translations from Kant are more numerous than those from all the rest of German literature. He assures us, with exaggeration of course, that there were thousands of commentaries on Kant's philosophy, all, almost without exception, wretched. He knew Kant even in Latin translations, and followed the study of his philosophy not only in Germany and England, but also in France. How carefully he had read Kant may be seen from a list of his magazine contributions:

Kant on National Character in Relation to the Sense of the Sublime and Beautiful. London Magazine, April 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey, Works XIV, 46 ff. A translation of *Von den nationalen Charakteren, in so ferne sie auf dem unterschiedlichen Gefühl des Erhabenen und Schönen beruhen*; in *Kritik der Urtheilskraft*; cf. Kant's sämmtliche Werke,¹ IV, 466 ff. De Quincey calls this paper shallow and trivial cf. Works VIII, 91.

¹ Herausgegeben von Rosenkranz und Schubart. 12 Bände. 1838—1842.

Kant's Abstract of Swedenborgianism, London Magazine, May 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey, Works XIV, 61 ff. A translation with slight omissions from *Träume eines Geistersehers*, cf. K's. Werke VII, 2. Theil, 2. Hauptstück, 88—98.

Kant's Idea of a Universal History on a Cosmo-political Plan. London Magazine, Oct. 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey, Works IX, 428 ff. A translation, with very slight omissions, of Kant's *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht*, cf. K's. Werke VII, 315 ff.

The Last Days of Immanuel Kant. Blackwood's Magazine, Feb. 1827. Reprinted by De Quincey, Works IV, 323 ff. For the most part a reproduction of Wasianski's *Kant in seinen letzten Lebensjahren*; with reference also to Borowski's *Darstellung des Lebens und Charakters Kant's*; Jachmann's *Immanuel Kant geschildert in Briefen*; and Rink's *Ansichten aus Immanuel Kant's Leben*. De Quincey refers also to Reichhardt.

Kant in his Miscellaneous Essays. Blackwood's Magazine, Aug. 1830. Criticism of Kant and abstracts or partial translations of 1, *Zum ewigen Frieden*,¹ cf. K's. Werke VII, 229 ff.; 2, *Ueber den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig seyn, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis*, K's. Werke VII, 175 ff. Not reprinted by De Quincey, Works VIII, 84 ff. The same essay by Kant is treated in a posthumous paper, a fragment, under the title: *Theory and Practice: Review of Kant's Essay on the common saying that such and such a thing may be true in theory but does not hold good in practice*. *Posthumous Works*, II, 182 ff.

¹ This paper referred to again, Works VIII, 388.

Kant on the age of the Earth. Tait's Magazine, Nov. 1833. Not reprinted by De Quincey, Works XIV, 69 ff. A translation of Kant's *Die Frage ob die Erde veralte?* cf. K's. Werke VI, 13.¹

German Studies and Kant in Particular; Tait's Magazine, June 1836. Not reprinted De Quincey. Works II, 80 ff. Also in *Uncollected Writings*, I, 91 ff. under the title: *The German Language and Philosophy of Kant*.

There are also somewhat extended notices of Kant in the “*Letters to a Young Man whose Education has been Neglected*,” (*London Magazine*, Jan., Feb., March, May, July 1823; reprinted by De Quincey, Works X, 64 ff.); in the essay on *Style* (*Blackwood's Magazine*, July, Sept., Oct. 1840, Feb. 1841; reprinted by De Quincey, Works X, 160 ff.); and in the essay on *Rhetoric* (*Blackwood's Magazine*, Dec. 1828; reprinted by De Quincey, Works X, 122 ff.).

References in his writings show that De Quincey was also acquainted with the following works of Kant:

Versuch den Begriff der negativen Grössen in die Weltweisheit einzuführen. cf. Works VIII, 196; XI, 12, note, 288.

Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen. cf. Works VIII, 125.

Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels. cf. Works IV, 334, note; VIII, 125; Kant's Werke VI, 89; Works XI, 260; Kant's Werke, VI, 206 f.

Streit der Facultäten. cf. Works VIII, 96.

¹ De Quincey refers twice to his translation; cf. Works VIII, 7. De Quincey and his Friends, 308.

Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft.
cf. Works VIII, 103, 398.

Ueber ein vermeintes Recht aus Menschenliebe zu lügen. cf. Works XIII, 13, note.

Ueber das Misslingen aller philosophischen Versuche in der Theodicee. cf. Works V, 65.

Geschichte und Naturbeschreibung der merkwürdigen Vorfälle des Erdbebens etc. cf. Posth. Works II, 134, note.

*Kritik der reinen Vernunft.*¹ cf. Works VII, 181; VIII, 264.

Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. cf. Works X, 160.

Kritik der Urtheilskraft. cf. Works XI, 293, note.

De Mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis Forma et Principiis. cf. Works IV, 328.

Lectures on Physical Geography. cf. Works VIII, 93.

It is safe to say that De Quincey knew the rest of Kant's essays in the volumes in which the above appeared. He had full acquaintance therefore with Kant's system, and he says frankly that he felt himself a master of it. "On some future day it is very possible that I may trouble you with a short exposition of the Transcendental Philosophy, so framed that, without foregoing one iota of technical rigour, it shall convey, for the first time, to merely English ears, a real account of what that philosophy is."² Here then, if anywhere, is the opportunity to study the intellectual character of De Quincey.

In order to understand the influence of Kant upon him, one trait of De Quincey's nature, already mentioned, should be emphasized. He was in no sense skeptical; his mind was religious and made for belief. It is for this

¹ cf. Posth. Works I, 195 and K. Werke II, 145.

² Works VIII, 87.

reason that his opinions on all important ideas in politics, religion or philosophy, changed so little. He had what might be called a high order of curiosity ; a quality which allowed him to follow many ideas to their logical extremes, to see them in their abstract truth ; yet often he shrank back from the fullest consequences, not logically, but with his feelings and beliefs. It is in this light that De Quincey's relation to Kant has a particular interest. No mind in the realm of pure speculation had so impressed him as the mind of Kant ; it is doubtful whether Shakespeare or Milton had so affected him. From the conclusions of the Critical Philosophy he could not escape ; he saw how irresistibly it led to the destruction of what he had believed necessary and final elements in the whole interpretation of the world. The regions which Kant placed in the unknown were precisely those in which De Quincey loved to let his mind wander ; not only the whole enthusiasm and daring of De Quincey's imagination, the deepest thing in him, but the objects of his dearest beliefs appeared to him as a mere dream of the mind ; even the laws of the world were, according to Kant, only the laws of the human spirit itself. The world which our own reason and senses shape is our world. Of anything more, of the reality of things apart from us, we can form no idea. This thought did not merely rouse De Quincey's intellect ; it completely overcame him.

He has sketched his feelings after his first reading of the Transcendental Philosophy in a paper on *German Studies and Kant in Particular, etc.*¹ At the time when German literature seemed to promise him everything,²

¹ Works II, 86.

² De Quincey was then twenty years old.

Kant stood as "the very tree of knowledge in the midst of this Eden". In Kant he had been taught to expect a new creative philosophy. "I looked confidingly", he writes, "to see the great vistas and avenues of truth laid open to the philosophic inquirer. Alas! all was a dream. Six weeks' study was sufficient to close my hopes in that quarter for ever". "For ten years afterwards," he writes a little farther on, "this philosophy shed the gloom of something like misanthropy upon my views and estimates of human nature; for man was an abject animal, if the limitations which Kant assigned to the motions of his speculative reason were as absolute and hopeless as, under his scheme of the understanding and his genesis of its powers, too evidently they were"; and farther still: "The profound shock with which I was repelled from German philosophy tinged thenceforwards my temper with cynical disgust towards man in certain aspects". Years later, when speaking of the immortality of the soul, he says with a kind of sadness; "Listen to no intellectual argument. One argument there is, one only there is, of philosophical value; an argument drawn from the *moral* nature of man: an argument of Immanuel Kant's. The rest are dust and ashes".¹

It is in this personal feeling that we are to seek the cause of De Quincey's failure to understand the constructive work of Kant, and perhaps also a few outbursts of pettiness on De Quincey's part. Writing in 1836, thirty years after his first study of the Critical Philosophy, he finds it still "a philosophy of destruction". "It offers nothing seducing to human aspirations, nothing splendid to the human imagination, nothing even positive and

¹ Works II, 402.

affirmative to the human understanding".¹ That expresses the real character of De Quincey; his critical talent is not great, he is at heart poet and dreamer. His instinct is for the sublime, for the feeling of certainty, for a belief that satisfies hope and yields something "splendid to the imagination". An idea must content him. He goes so far as to say that he cannot imagine why the Germans have received the Transcendental Philosophy so enthusiastically, "except from profound incomprehension of its meaning and utter blindness to its drift". On this ground De Quincey has been criticised very severely by Mr. J. H. Stirling.² Mr. Stirling gives De Quincey little credit for even a knowledge of Kant, and draws a most unfavorable contrast between Kant's stern labor and pursuit of truth, and the gossiping, fanciful and ineffectual character of De Quincey. But we are much more ready to agree in many respects with a reply to Mr. Stirling by Mr. S. H. Hodgson.³ Mr. Hodgson points out that De Quincey had approached Kant with the ideas of the Church of England, and from that point of view calls Kant destructive. Yet it was more. It was not a mere sweeping away of "the speculative foundations of theology" as Mr. Hodgson expresses it. It was no mere logical experience. The forms of the English church and the ideas of Protestantism were so bound up with the imagination and spiritual sympathies of De Quincey, with a world that was to him as real as the external one,⁴

¹ Works II, 86.

² Fortnightly Review, Oct. 1867: *De Quincey and Coleridge upon Kant*.

³ In *De Quincey and his Friends*, 337 ff.

⁴ cf. Autobiographic Sketches; Works I, 44, 46 ff., as an example of the way the ritual and forms of the English service had taken possession of De Quincey's imagination.

that Kant seemed to him, for the time at least, to have upturned the very foundations of things.

Mr. Hodgson describes it well: "De Quincey's position is that of a man forced to give an unwilling assent to the main conceptions of a system, which he regards with dismay, as destroying, or at least endangering, the best hopes and aspirations of humanity".¹ Whatever apparent contradictions there are in De Quincey's criticism of Kant, are to be traced to this conflict between the logical conclusions which he felt compelled to draw, and the most profound feelings and desires of his nature. That De Quincey appreciated, at least in part, the constructive side of Kant's chief *Critique*, we shall see farther on; but he certainly failed to recognize the essentially positive character of the rest of Kant's philosophy. He refers to Kant's proof of the immortality of the soul, and the demonstration, on moral grounds, of the belief in a Deity (VIII, 261 f.). He speaks of the "emphatic truth and grandeur" with which Kant treated the moral nature; but this side of Kant's philosophy does not seem to have restored fully what the first destroyed.

From the same standpoint we are to explain certain violent and petulant outbursts of De Quincey. He speaks of Kant's "Ghoulish creed";² he says that Kant "rejoiced in the prospect of absolute and ultimate annihilation"; he allows himself to write: "The King of Prussia, though a personal friend of Kant's, found himself obliged to level his state thunders at some of his doctrines and terrified him in his advance; else I am persuaded that Kant would have formally delivered Atheism from the professor's

¹ De Quincey and his Friends. 340.

² Works II, 155.

chair My own belief is that the king had private information of Kant's ultimate tendencies, as revealed in his table talk";¹ or again, "He had no instincts of creation or restoration within his Apollyon mind; for he had no love, no faith, no self-distrust, no humility, no childlike docility". It is on such expressions as these, taken for the most part from a single essay, that Mr. Stirling's criticism is based. But that is not De Quincey's final opinion; for in 1830 he writes: "I will never believe that Kant was capable (as some have represented him) of ridiculing in conversation the hopes of immortality; for that is both incredible for itself and in contradiction to many passages in his writings".²

There are other expressions against Kant's sincerity and honorable character which we cannot account for except as a yielding to that sudden caprice of judgment, to his mere whim and humor, which mars so much of De Quincey's work. "Not content with the privilege of speaking in an infidel tone, and with philosophic liberty, he manifestly thinks of Christianity with enmity—nay, with spite".³ "That he was mean and little-minded in his hatred to Christianity is certain. He is compelled to do unwilling homage to the greatness of Christian morals". A note of Kant's on a remarkable numeral cabala in connection with Biblical chronology⁴ (K's. Werke X, 319 f., note), and a remark on Catholicism (ib. X, 318—19, note) are for De Quincey other examples of Kant's hostility to Christianity. It is unnecessary to quote at length these remarks of Kant. Suffice it to say that

¹ Works II, 155; written in 1834.

² Ib. VIII, 95.

³ Works VIII, 95. cf. also II, 155.

⁴ Ib. VIII, 95.

De Quincey's treatment of them is pedantic and petty, and is based on the most scattered and isolated references. He must have known what Kant's real opinion was; he could not have read so widely as he had done without noticing that Kant's veneration for Christianity "in some cardinal points" did not arise from his hostility to it, a kind of "unwilling homage".¹ It is inconceivable that he should ever have given expression to such false opinions, except under the supposition that he was expressing his own personal disappointment and grudge against Kant; for he knew much better Kant's real position.

The most bitter illustration of this spirit of criticism appears in connection with Kant's famous letter to the King of Prussia: "Surely grey hairs and irreligion make a monstrous union; and the spirit of proselytism carried into the service of infidelity, youthful zeal put forth by a tottering decrepit old man to withdraw from poor desponding and suffering human nature, its most essential props, whether for action or for suffering, for conscience or for hope, is a spectacle too disgusting to leave much sympathy with merit of another kind."² Or further, "Kant must have been animated by spite or vanity in disseminating his views. . . . And melancholy it is to record that Kant, — the upright, stern, stoical Kant, — in his answer to the King shuffled, juggled, equivocated, in fact it must be avowed, lied." Kant's defence, that the letter was not written for the public, but for scholars, De Quincey calls "shameless falsehood". Kant concealed his real purpose by a mere artifice. It was "neither good faith nor plain dealing." He promised as "his Majesty's most faithful subject" not

¹ Works VIII, 95.

² Ib. VIII, 103.

to give any offence, a phrase, which he explains himself in his note as "limiting the engagement only to the King's life". It is possible to speak unfavorably of the last remark, but not with a knowledge of the real Kant in all his relations.¹

But Kant shocked not only De Quincey's beliefs, but also his tastes and imagination. He calls Kant a pedant and something of a brute. He alludes to Kant's pretences to a knowledge of the world, literature, society and art; but "under all these disguises it is very evident that Kant's original determination was to a coarse, masculine pursuit of science, and that literature in its finer departments, whose essence is power, not knowledge, was to him, at all parts of his life an object of secret contempt".² Here the fine literary and poetic sense of De Quincey influenced his judgement; the opinion is totally false.

Such criticism is the more remarkable, because De Quincey shows on the whole a thorough appreciation of Kant's character, and an understanding of at least a part of the Critical Philosophy. We find De Quincey's serious opinion, when he calls Kant "the most sincere, honourable and truthful of human beings";³ when he speaks of "the stern integrity of Kant", "the direct and simple-minded Kant".

¹ cf. K.'s *Werke* X, 251 ff. cf. also *Fortnightly Review*, Oct. 1. 1867, p. 378, and an article by J. P. Nichol reprinted in *De Quincey Memorials*, Vol. II, Appendix 259 ff. This appeared originally in the *Glasgow University Album* for 1854, calling De Quincey's attention to the statements and asking him to give his grounds for them in the edition of the collected works. But the statements were not changed and De Quincey made no explanation. The article in *Blackwood's Magazine* in which these charges occur was not republished; but there is no evidence that De Quincey's intention was to withdraw them.

² *Works* VIII, 91.

³ *Ib.* X, 262, note.

We shall look in vain in De Quincey for any complete sketch of the Transcendental Philosophy. Much of what he says is little better than magazine gossip of a clever and personal kind. He is never through with laughing over Kant's style;¹ certain anecdotes always amuse him;² there are bits of interesting information; for example, Kant's opinion of the partition of Poland; the fine quality of Kant's Latin style",³ etc. One may laugh with De Quincey but there is little in such remarks-as the following: "Were it not that veneration and gratitude cause us to suspend harsh words with regard to such a man, who has upon the greatest question affecting our human reason almost, we might say, *revealed* the truth (viz., in his theory of the categories), we should describe him, and continually we are tempted to describe him as the most superhuman of recorded blockheads."⁴ (This in connection with Kant's style of exposition.) Most of these essays are more valuable as affording insight into De Quincey's manner of thinking and writing than as a criticism of Kant. The logical faculty, the mastery of materials, is one of the qualities for which De Quincey has often been praised. Here it is totally absent. His mind springs from one idea to another; one thing reminds him of something else; there is no development whatever; before the end of the paper he has forgotten his original plan. What would a close analysis of the article in *Blackwood's* (August 1830) leave? His subject is *Kant in his Miscellaneous Essays*. He chooses these, he says, because the more visionary Transcendental Philosophy

¹ Works II, 83; X, 122, 160 ff., 259, 262, note.

² cf. e. g. De Quincey and his Friends, 177 f.

³ Works IV, 33 f., note; V, 143; VI, 102.

⁴ Posth. Works II, 182.

might not be interesting; from this remark he turns with good-natured ridicule to Kant's style and German pedantic terminology; then to Kant's contempt for art and literature; his lack of reading; his attitude to Christianity and his relations with the King. A note of Kant's on the Cabala connects itself naturally with this part of the essay; a note by Kant on the preceding page occasions the long discussion of a point raised by him in connection with the Catholics. De Quincey then takes up the essay on *Theory and Practice*, but in the most fragmentary way; he translates certain parts of it until a remark of Kant's on the English constitution rouses his wrath, and with a discussion of that point the treatment of the essay ends; then with a translation of the chief propositions in the essay *Zum ewigen Frieden*, the paper is ready for the press.

De Quincey's only attempt to give a connected exposition of even a part of Kant's philosophy is found in the essay already mentioned, *German Studies and Kant in Particular*, written in 1836.

He sketches Kant's development from the dogmatism of Wolf to the skepticism of Hume; to his sense of the weakness of the empirical philosophy and the necessity of the *a priori* character of causation; to the derivation of the other categories and the necessity of them as forms of the mind itself. "Without going one step further, the reader will find grounds enough for reflection, and for reverence towards Kant in these two great results: 1st., that an order of ideas has been established, which all deep philosophy has demanded, even when it could not make good its claim; 2ndly., The postulate is fulfilled without mysticism or Platonic reveries".¹ He then states briefly the

¹ Works II, 99.

method of the antinomies,¹ the *a priori* character of space and time ; and the validity which Geometry gains through it (the latter is stated very finely). This and the doctrine of the categories he accepts unreservedly.² "All the rest, with a reserve as to the part which concerns the practical reason, is of more questionable value and leads to manifold disputes". There are besides certain references which show an acquaintance with other parts of Kant's system. He shows (VIII, 261) a knowledge of the criticism of speculative theology ; he recognizes Kant's services in mathematics (IV, 430) ; also in defining the sphere of logic, although Kant volunteered no extensions to formal logic with the single exception of the *Judicia infinita* (cf. Works V, 337.) His other references to Kant are either repetitions of what has been already said or without significance.

We see that De Quincey's idea of the Critical Philosophy was clear enough ; he saw its consequences all too well reconcile it with his old conceptions. The deductions from it, he writes, "are of a nature to make any man melancholy". When one considers "that there is the greatest reason to doubt, whether the idea of causation is at all applicable to any other than a human experience he will find the steadfast earth itself rocking as it were, beneath his feet ; a world about him, which is in sense a world of deception".³ "As often as I looked into his works, I exclaimed in my heart, with the widowed queen of Carthage 'Quaesivit lucem ingemuitque reperta'."⁴ We cannot escape from ourselves ;

¹ cf. also for references to the antinomies. Ib. VII, 181 ; VIII, 264.

² Other references which show that De Quincey understood the significance of Kant and recognized the value of his system. De Quincey and his Friends, 143 ; Works IV, 326.

³ Works II, 101.

⁴ Ib. II, 108.

all that we hope and believe is but the projection of our own thoughts; the world is but our dream and shadow. That was the feeling Kant's philosophy gave De Quincey.

"Had the transcendental philosophy", he writes, "corresponded to my expectations, and had it left important openings for further pursuit, my purpose then was, to have retired, after a few years spent at Oxford, to the woods of Lower Canada".¹ But his speculative interests were deadened by Kant. Only once does he give any clear intimation of the higher character of Kant's work. "There are particular applications of his philosophy, not contemplated by himself, for which we venture to predict that even the religious student will be grateful".² But he gives no intimation of what these are.

From this sketch it will be readily seen, that De Quincey failed to understand the positive side of Kant. The later developments of philosophy in Germany had evidently not the same interest for him. Nor had he strength to use Kant's ideas as a beginning in an original constructive way. De Quincey's philosophical talent was distinctly appreciative and receptive, but in no sense original and creative. That is the most interesting fact in connection with his study of Kant. He made no attempt, saw no way to harmonize the old with the new. He must have tried to bridge the chasm; but he has left no record of it. So the two existed in his mind side by side; the one, the region of mere speculation, swayed by the force of Kant; the other, that of belief and practical life, of his desires and imagination.

¹ Works II, 108.

² Ib. X, 160.

To any final value as criticism these papers have no claim. They may show, however, the philosophic trend of De Quincey's mind. Certainly they give us no ground for the great reputation in this direction which De Quincey enjoyed among his contemporaries. De Quincey had a keen sense for philosophical ideas; he realized them swiftly; and he had a mind eminently fitted to explain them. Yet he has left nothing to show that his talent in this direction was in any way extraordinary. His criticism deals for the most part with the merest details. He had philosophical talent, but his deeper genius was not scientific; it was imaginative.

SCATTERED REFERENCE TO KANT:

Kant's comparison of a scholar proposing some insoluble problem which a second sits down to solve, to a person trying to milk a he-goat while another holds the pail. cf. Works VIII, 11.

Kant's praise of the English reverence for truth. ib. VIII, 364; X, 262, note.

Kant's explanation of the etymology of the word "Historie". ib. VI, 102.

Kant's remark that merely to clear up the boundaries of the different sciences, which might seem merely a negative service, is a great positive advance. ib. XI, 163.

A question of Kant's, whether, inasmuch as the poor horse shares so largely in human miseries, it had happened to the paradisaical horse that he had eaten forbidden hay. cf. Page's Life II, 104.

"An infidel philosopher of Germany who held the opinion that the moral ideal of Christianity was in a sense a union of Stoicism and Epicureanism." cf. Works VI, 345 f. De Quincey elsewhere (III, 49, note) ascribes this to Kant.

A general Kantian rule that every sensation runs through all gradations from the lowest or most obscure and nascent to the highest. cf. Posth. Works I, 228.

A remark of Kant's to the effect that Christianity has not improved the moral condition of the world. cf. Works VIII, 96.

A reference to the science of Algebra. ib. IX, 149.

Kant's criticism of Newton's theory of a vacuum, ib. VIII, 86.

Commentators and Translators.

De Quincey mentions the following:

Beck, Jacob Sigismund (1761—1840); cf. Works X, 70.
Fichte; ib.

Kiesewetter, Joh. Gottfr. Karl Christian (1766—1819);
ib. 77.

Nitsch; ib. 65 ff. Nitsch published a work called:
A General and Introductory View of Kant's Principles concerning Man, the World and the Deity. London, 1796.

Reinhold, Karl Leonhard (1758—1825); ib. 70.

Schmidt, Joh. Ernst Christ. (1772—1831); ib. 67,
note. VIII, 88.

Schulze, Gottlob Ernst (1761—1833); ib. X, 70.

Schelling; ib. 70.

Tieftrunk, Joh. Heinrich (1759—1837); ib. VIII, 90.

Willich; ib. 65 ff. Willich published a work called:
Elements of the Critical Philosophy, Loudon, 1798.

Of these, Beck, Fichte, Reinhold, Schelling, Schulze and Tieftrunk, according to De Quincey, understood Kant. For the others he has only contempt. De Quincey mentions no particular work except Schmidt's *Dictionary*. Perhaps this is *Erläuterungen der transzendentalen Philosophie*.

sophie. 1800. Nitsch and Willich were Germans resident in England.

Among French and English critics of Kant, De Quincey refers to Madame de Staël (cf. Works X, 68, 77) and Degerando (ib. 69 ff.); to Coleridge (ib. 68, 77) and Dugald Stewart (ib. 68 ff.; *De Quincey and his Friends* 75, 143). Of these, with the exception of Coleridge, he has a poor opinion. Even in Coleridge De Quincey finds no faithful exposition of Kant's system, because, in his opinion, Coleridge's mind modified everything that passed through it.

De Quincey refers also to Latin translations:

Schmidt-Phiseldk, C. F. (1770—1832). A translation of the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*; cf. Works II, 89, note; IV, 324, note; by the same author *Philosophiae criticae secundum Kantium expositio systematica*, 1796; cf. Works X, 71, note.

Born, F. G. (1743—1807). *Critica rationis purae*, 1796—98. cf. Works II, 89, note; IV, 324, note.

De Quincey refers to Kant's relations with Herder; and Herder's criticism of Kant. cf. Works IV, 393.

X. DE QUINCEY AND JEAN PAUL.

More than to any other German writer De Quincey felt himself attracted to Jean Paul. He had read him early in Wales; twenty years later he was studying *Comet*, which had just appeared (1820—22). That he felt himself perfectly familiar with Richter is certain, for he promised to draw up a classification of his writings. This, however, never appeared; his only contributions were an article, *John Paul Frederick Richter*, a series of short translations, *Analects from Richter*, and two other longer ones, *Dream of the Universe* and *Last Will and Testament — The House of Weeping*.¹ De Quincey knew certainly the following works of Jean Paul: *Hesperus*, *Titan*, *Comet*, *Flegeljahre*, *Siebenkäs*, *Vorschule der Aesthetik*, *Brief an meinen Sohn Hans Paul über*

¹ London Magazine, Dec. 1821; Feb. and March 1823. *The Happy Life of a Parish Priest in Sweden* and *The Last Will and Testament* etc. appeared in connection with the article on Richter in Dec. 1821. The second of these was not reprinted by De Quincey. He apologizes later for his translation of the first, executed, he says, before he had a complete knowledge of German. (cf. Works XI, 273, note). The other *Analects* appeared in Feb. 1824, with the exception of the *Dream of the Universe*, which appeared in March. They were reprinted by De Quincey with the exception of a few fragments. cf. Works XI, 259 ff.

*Philosophie. Wahrheit aus Jean Pauls Leben.*¹ His longer translations are: *Last Will and Testament*. — *The House of Weeping*. (Chapter I of the *Flegeljahre*, Jean Paul's Werke XX, 3ff.)². *The Happy Life of a Parish Priest in Sweden*, ib. 22 ff. *The Dream of the Universe*. (*Comet*, Vol. XXVIII, 148 ff.)³

From his translations alone one might see what attracted De Quincey towards Jean Paul. They show for the most part tender feeling, symbolism and allegory, the vague or the grand, meditative sentiment or fantastic humor.

De Quincey's criticism of Jean Paul may be summed up as follows:⁴ Until the appearance of Schiller, Jean Paul was the first mind in Germany fitted to command the respect of foreign peoples.⁵ He is the most original writer in Germany; his mind "unless moving from an impulse self-derived, cannot move at all". In equal mastery of pathos and humor, he is much the superior of Sterne, indeed, the most remarkable since Shakespeare. "John Paul's intellect, — his faculty of catching at a glance all the relations of objects, both the grand, the lovely, the ludicrous, and the fantastic — is painfully and almost morbidly active". Here again he is like Shakespeare, if in a far less degree. In this lies the difficulty of Jean Paul's style, not in his language. He is elliptical because his mind sees simultaneously points

¹ For the last cf. Froude, *Thomas Carlyle, The First Forty Years of his Life* I, 415.

² Jean Paul's sämmtliche Werke, 33 Bände. Berlin 1841—42.

³ For other translations from Richter see Appendix I.

⁴ For the most part taken from the article *John Paul Frederick Richter*, cf. Works XI, 259 ff.

⁵ Ib. IV, 431.

of thought far remote. He seems obscure because "the vast expansion and discursiveness in his range of notice and observation carries him into every department and nook of human life, of science, of art and of literature"; because "the fineness and evanescent brilliancy of his oblique glances and surface-skimmering allusions, often fling but half a meaning on the mind". No book is so full of wit as the *Forschule der Aesthetik*. Jean Paul is the Rousseau and Sterne of Germany.¹ He is the greatest of all subjective writers, of those whose qualities consist in "the absorption of the universal into the concrete, of the pure intellect into the human nature of the author".² As mere rhetorician in the grand sonorous style Jean Paul occasionally reaches the level of Jeremy Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne, a balance of "the two opposite forces of eloquent passion and rhetorical fancy".³

De Quincey himself says that reverence for Jean Paul as a man was one of the chief causes of his admiration. Goethe is "a mere corrupted pygmy"⁴ in comparison. De Quincey quotes approvingly the estimate of Herder, "I willingly pardon him his want of ordonnance and of metre in consideration of high-toned virtue, his living world, his profound heart, his creative and plastic intellect". In the benignity of his disposition he is again like Shakespeare.

In many respects this criticism of Jean Paul is equally true of De Quincey. His own mind springs from thought to thought with marvelous rapidity. He too, has in

¹ Works IV, 389.

² Ib. V, 218.

³ Works X, 104.

⁴ So Carlyle describes De Quincey's opinion of the two men. cf. Froude I, 396.

his own words, "the power of seeing and connecting things naturally far remote."¹ Every allusion calls up a host of facts, poetic ideas, or humorous suggestions. This was a matter of pride to De Quincey; but it is often nothing more than a leaping from point to point; often he seems the slave of allusion; and it leads him sometimes into mere pedantry or heavy wit.² He too loves the grand and vague; imaginative passion and rhetorical fancy are likewise the chief qualities of his style. De Quincey found in Jean Paul more than a similarity of taste and style; he found a thoroughly congenial nature.

One might get the impression from part of this paper that De Quincey was a man of narrow, perhaps pedantic interests, endowed at best with a purely intellectual faculty. But such an idea would be far from the whole truth. As a matter of fact De Quincey had a lively interest in all the affairs of the time, political and social as well as literary and philosophical. He was a recluse, but from his windows he had watched the life on the streets. His sympathies were given without reserve; there was the deepest tenderness in him; he never lost his caprices, his vanities, the feelings of frank delight, of sympathy, of awe, of wonder. Events and impressions lived in his imagination with the vividness of childhood; they grew in the memory; the thoughts and feelings of years gathered about them till they floated before him as a visionary world.³

Such is *The Daughter of Lebanon*,⁴ in which the figure of

¹ See e. g. the discussion of a point raised by Kant, Works VIII, 99 ff.

² e. g. ib. XI, 269, note.

³ See Posth. Works I, 27 or *Autobiographic Sketches*.

⁴ Works III, 450 ff. cf. for other examples: *The Vision of Sudden*

the girl Ann, whom he had known long before in the London streets, becomes a symbol of things beyond his power to express. Whatever he has of fancy, poetry or style, here unite. De Quincey was no logical machine. His dream fancies all sprang from the heart. Their soil was his own experience. Their subject is always one of passion or awfulness; he realizes certain great phenomena and feelings, such as death, sorrow, the spaces between the stars, the limits of the finite, as definite presences; these abstractions become tangible and visible. Nothing is so remarkable in him as this strange, cumulative imagination. What an impression the single word "pariah" made upon De Quincey! He read eagerly of the Cagots in the Pyrenees, of lepers, of all that concerned the Pariah class, till it became an actuality to him. That word conjured up as by witchcraft a thousand pictures, not statistics or ideas, but things that he had seen, in the actual world or that of the imagination; Ann again on the streets; then, with a widening of his thoughts, not her alone, but the whole street with other cities, other lands, till whole classes, castes and tribes, the outcast and wronged of the world, in all time past and to come, rose up in living multitudes before him. So too on the mail-coach; he feels himself borne onward; the fancy rises with the roll of the wheels. In his mind he sees the city, the vast unknown towards which they go. He thinks of other highways, of other coaches here and there hastening to and from the city through the length and breadth of England, of the net-work of roads, the coaches like great shuttles of trade flying to and fro, till

the whole postal system shapes itself before him as a living picture, with the force of visible sensation. So, years afterwards, as he thinks of his sister's death, every circumstance, every feeling returns with its original power; and all that had ever mingled with his thoughts of that time floats grand and shadowy about him. "Again the pomps of life rise up in silence, the glory of summer, the Syrian sunlights, the frosts of death".¹ Take a single phrase: "Suddenly as from the chambers of the air opening in revelation"; the mind has seen that; even the invisible phenomena of nature and the feelings of the heart become for De Quincey a kind of spectacle, a gigantic picturesque. First let us take him simply; he is attempting to describe the impression of Indian summer: "The day on which I left Oswestry was a day of golden sunshine amongst the closing days of November. As truly as Jessica's moonlight ('Merchant of Venice') this golden sunshine might be said to *sleep* upon the woods and the fields; so awful was the universal silence, so profound the deathlike stillness. It was a day belonging to a brief and pathetic season of farewell summer resurrection, when the gentle process of collapsing life, no longer fretted by countermovements, slips away with holy peace into the noiseless deeps of the Infinite. So sweet, so ghostly, in its soft, golden smiles, silent as a dream, and quiet as the dying trance of a saint, faded through all its stages this departing day."² Or again on a higher level: "I stood checked for a moment; awe, not fear fell upon me; and whilst I stood, a solemn wind began to blow — the saddest that ear ever heard. It

¹ Works I, 50.

² Works III, 348 f.

was a wind that might have swept the fields of mortality for a thousand centuries. Many times since, upon summer days, when the sun is about the hottest, I have remarked the same wind arising and uttering the same hollow, solemn, Memnonian, but saintly swell. It is in this world the one great audible symbol of eternity."¹ Here is the deepest quality of De Quincey; the sense of wonder and awe which holds the imagination through phase after phase of feeling, till it stands on the very limits of life.

In spite of all that has been said of De Quincey's scholarship, research, or speculative talent, we are forced to the conclusion that his real distinction is not the thinking faculty, but the writing faculty. He is a rhetorician of the first rank; at his best he is a master of a rhythmical fine style, filled with emotion and poetry. He loves to open long avenues of approach to his thought; he loves the rise and fall in the music of a sentence, the slow sweeping cadence. Take the following: "Five years after I saw that sweet face in reality — saw it in the flesh; saw that pomp of womanhood; saw that cottage; saw a thousand times that domicile that heard the cooing of the solitary dove in the solitary morning."² Or again: "The world disappears: I see only the grand reliques of a world — memorials of a love that has departed, has been — the record of a sorrow that is, and has its greyness converted into verdure — monuments of a wrath that has been reconciled, of a wrong that has been atoned for — convulsions of a storm that has gone by."³

¹ Works I, 41.

² Posth. Works I, 20. Other examples of De Quincey's style: Works I, 40 ff., 49—50, 57 ff.; III, 446; V, 384; XIII, 310 ff., 317—18, 359 ff.

³ Posth. Works I, 19.

In these examples De Quincey turns back to linger over the tragic experiences of his youth and here his style is at his best; elsewhere his rhetoric shows often the passion of the fancy rather than the natural feelings of the heart; at times he loves the style for its own sake, the mere musical effect of words, the sensations called up by the sound.

In much of this there will be seen a strong resemblance to Jean Paul;¹ but De Quincey was in no sense a

¹ Masson: *De Quincey*, p. 198 ff. "One ought to remember, however, how much he must have been influenced by the previous example of Jean Paul Richter. There can be no doubt that Richter's example influenced De Quincey permanently. But, though he may have learnt something from Richter, he was an original master in the same art."

Saintsbury, *Essays in English Literature* (1780—1860), 2nd edition, London 1891, p. 320 f. "If I may refine a little, I should say, that there was very frequently, if not generally, a humorous basis for these divagations of De Quincey's; but that he almost invariably lost sight of that basis, and proceeded to reason quite gravely away from it, in what is (not entirely with justice) called the scholastic manner. How much of this was due to the influence of Jean Paul and the other German humorists of the last century, with whom he became acquainted very early, I should not like to say."

Fowler, *XIX. Century Prose*, London 1897, p. 34. "Impassioned prose was not a new thing. It had been written by Sir Thomas Browne (in his *Urn-Burial*), by Jeremy Taylor and others in English. In German the dreams inserted by Richter in his *Flower, Fruit and Thorn Pieces* furnish a still closer parallel. By all these writers De Quincey was consciously influenced."

A German writing in *Hogg's Instructor* on *Der Englische Opium-Esser* says; (cf. Page's Life II, 232 ff.) In the cloud-world of dreams, when deep sleep falleth on man, and his thoughts wander through eternity, and he cannot tell whence they come or whither they go — our own Jean Paul is reputed the archdreamer. But I question whether he is not surpassed by De Quincey in the stupendous awe, the oppressive reality, the intense significance, the colossal sublimity of those visions of the night His dreams, while we at once recognize their truthfulness and reality, are *sui generis*".

cf. also F. Christoph: *Ueber den Einfluss Jean Paul Friedr. Richters auf Thomas de Quincey*. Progr. des Gymnasiums in Hof, 1899.

conscious imitator. Jean Paul may have really influenced Carlyle; Goethe certainly did; Goethe gave him direction, gave him a measure of clearness. But no such close relation is to be sought for between Jean Paul and De Quincey. De Quincey was attracted to Jean Paul as to one of like tastes and sympathies; but his mind would have taken the same direction under any circumstances. That Jean Paul's influence was no formative one can, we think, be clearly shown.

Although De Quincey was beginning his eighteenth year when he made the acquaintance of Jean Paul, his own tastes, his disposition, even in some degree his manner of writing had already taken form. Letters,¹ written while he was yet a schoolboy, show in a remarkable degree many of the later peculiarities of his style; there is the same love of analysis, the same turn to many of the sentences, the same instinct for fine discrimination; there are already instances of the peculiar humor and smartness which one finds so frequently in his later papers; and finally the touch of poetry and fancy. All his intellectual tastes, except those purely abstract, seem to have been already fixed. Moreover, the dreaming power, the quality in which he most resembles Jean Paul; is precisely that which De Quincey felt to be most original.² He had the "constitutional determination to reverie" which he says is necessary if a man is to "dream magnificently".

De Quincey, moreover, understood so clearly the strength and weakness of Jean Paul that he could be no *mére imitator*. He writes: "This most brilliant of all

¹ Page's Life I, 48 f., 74 ff.

² Works I. 14.

German writers wanted in that field (dream-fantasy), the severe simplicity, that horror of the *too much*, belonging to Grecian architecture, which is essential to the perfection of a dream considered as a work of art. Too elaborate he was and too artificial to realize the grandeur of the shadowy."¹ De Quincey himself is not always free from the fault he criticises. But in his best work there is far more concentration than in Jean Paul; there is more skill, more balance and restraint; a more sure and clear elaboration. Much in Jean Paul is the mere riot of the imagination.

Jean Paul has feeling and sentiment. He writes for example in the *Traum über das All*: "Das Leuchten und das Tönen überwältigte sanft das Herz; ich war voll Freuden, ohne zu wissen, woher sie zu mir kamen; es war ein Freuen über Sein und Ewigsein und eine unaussprechliche Liebe fasste, ohne dass ich wusste, wofür, mich an, wenn ich in das neue Licht-All um mich sah" De Quincey's manner is more objective. He sees everything as a kind of grand picturesque, as when he describes the flight of the spirits through the heavens. "Then, from a distance that is counted only in heaven, light dawned for a time through a sleepy film: by un-

¹ Ib. VIII, 33, note. This remark occurs in connection with De Quincey's second rendering of the *Traum über das All*. It is not a translation (a translation appears among the *Analects* 1824), but a reproduction of Jean Paul's idea after a single reading twenty years before. (The paper in which it occurs, *System of the Heavens, as viewed through Lord Rosse's telescope*, appeared in 1846). This is by no means a good example of De Quincey's point; for his own rendering is at times very elaborate, and he falls often into the error for which he blames Jean Paul. Some of his other descriptions, too, are so vague, so crowded with detail and so complicated in movement, that the impression is confused. For examples cf. Works III, 343 f.; XIII, 318 ff.

utterable pace the light swept to *them*; they by unutterable pace to the light: in a moment the rushing of planets was upon them: in a moment the blazing of suns was around them. Then came eternities of twilight, that revealed, but were not revealed. To the right hand and to the left towered mighty constellations, that by self-repetitions and by answers from afar, that by counter-positions, that by mysterious combinations, built up triumphal gates, whose architraves, whose archways — horizontal, upright — rested, rose — at altitudes, by spans — that seemed ghostly from infinitude.”¹ Even in his translation he often heightens with a word or phrase the vaguer style of Jean Paul; e. g.: “Thus we flew on through the starry wildernesses: one heaven after another unfurled its immeasurable banners before us, and then rolled up behind us.” In the original: “So flogen wir durch die gestirnten Wüsten; ein Himmel nach dem andern erweiterte sich vor uns, und vereinigte sich hinter uns.” Or again, the addition of a single word: in the original: “Da berührte mich die Gestalt wie ein warmer Hauch”; in De Quincey: “Then the form touched me like the flowing of a breath.” Jean Paul works more unconsciously. There are scores of descriptions in his novels which leave no impression on the mind, except the vague rapture and “Schwärmerie” of the dreamer. It is often impossible for him to see the object truly, he has so little control over his feelings or his fancy. *The Vision of Sudden Death*² on the other hand has the perfect grouping, the certainty of marble. Moreover the

¹ Works XIII, 34. From De Quincey’s later rendering of *Jean Paul’s Traum über das All*.

² Works XIII, 311 ff.

subjects of Jean Paul's dreams are comparatively few: death, "Lebenslust", the sentiment of the Infinite, landscape. The things of which De Quincey dreams, are more various: the girl Ann in the street; the fall of Napoleon; a mail-coach sweeping down a carriage; the transfigured image of his sister. The titles of his *Suspiria de Profundis* show the field in which his fancy moved.¹

The Palimpsest of the Human Brain.

Levana and our Ladies of Sorrow.

The Dreadful Infant (There was the glory of innocence made perfect; there was the dreadful beauty of infancy that had seen God).

Foundering Ships.

Count the Leaves in Vallombrosa.

But if I submitted with Resignation, not the less I searched for the Unsearchable — sometimes in Arab Deserts, sometimes in the Sea.

Who is this Woman that for some Months has followed me up and down? Her face I cannot see, for she keeps for ever behind me.

Who is this Woman that beckoneth and warneth me from the Place where she is, and in whose Eyes is Woeful remembrance? I guess who she is.

Oh, sweep away, Angel, with Angelic Scorn the Dogs that come with Curious Eyes to gaze.

What a fancy is this! Foundering Ships, The Leaves at Vallombrosa; what pictures they would conjure up, more tragic and suggestive, more directly and visibly conceived than the romantic raptures of Jean Paul. De Quincey is more the master of the grand and terrible,

¹ Posth. Works I, 4 f. Only a few of these were written; the series which De Quincey planned was never completed.

no less than of the mysterious and calmly beautiful.¹ Even in the field where the two have most resemblance, in the personification of the great forces of nature, De Quincey reaches a repose and grandeur, rare in Jean Paul.

De Quincey has described his own dream fantasy, when he speaks of "the shadowy projections, *umbras* and *penumbras*, which the unsearchable depths of man's nature is capable, under adequate excitement, of throwing off, and *even into stationary forms*".² (The last italics are ours). Or again. "Perhaps you are aware of that power in the eyes of many children by which in darkness they project a vast theatre of phantasmagorical figures moving forwards or backwards between their bed-curtains and the chamber-walls. In some children this power is semi-voluntary — they can control or perhaps suspend the shows; but in others it is altogether automatic. I myself, at the date of my last confessions, had seen in this way more processions, generally solemn, mournful, belonging to eternity, but also at times glad, triumphal pomps, that seemed to enter the gates of Time — than all the religions of paganism, fierce or gay, ever witnessed. Now, there is in the dark places of the human spirit — in grief, in fear, in vindictive wrath — a power of self-projection not unlike to this".³ Or once more: "My eye had been couched into a secondary power of vision, by misery, by solitude, by sympathy with life in all its modes, by experience too early won and by the sense

¹ Posth. Works I, 16 ff. for a perfect example of De Quincey's mastery in this style.

² Posth. Works I, 9.

³ Posth. Works I, 7 f.

of danger critically escaped".¹ The last describes his mind before he had read Jean Paul.

Jean Paul was thus a writer to attract De Quincey strongly; it is possible indeed that Jean Paul's influence may have had much to do with De Quincey's form of composition; that he even suggested to De Quincey the very form of the dream fantasy; but from what has been already said, from the austerity of De Quincey's imagination, from the peculiar subjects of his dreams, from his own understanding of Jean Paul's weakness, from his consciousness of his originality in this respect, from the independence and superior rhetorical quality of his style, from the peculiar character of his method and imagination, it is clear that De Quincey was not, in any essential way, indebted to Jean Paul. De Quincey's temperament was too critical, his admiration was too tempered to lead to anything like a close imitation. Further he lacks the mysticism that one finds in the German; Jean Paul's dream passes easily into pantheistic reverie. Finally we have de Quincey's own declaration that the peculiar character of his dreams had developed in childhood.²

De Quincey was very fond of the humor of Jean Paul. His own humor is similar in many ways. *The Last Will and Testament* in the *Flegeljahre* might easily have been written by De Quincey. Both have observation, kindness, exaggeration, a love of the ludicrous, and a keen insight into the weaknesses and foibles of certain types of character. But neither of them has in the truest sense the humor of human nature. It runs easily into caricature. The basis of it is the

¹ Works II, 55.

² Works I, 32.

ridiculous and both succeed best in pure extravaganza. "Er besass mehr Fröhlichkeit der Laune als des Herzens", one might say of both as Wilhelm Meister says of Hamlet, though the words are perhaps truer of De Quincey than of Jean Paul. As typical examples of the latter let us take the following. He is describing a man who has a very disagreeable duty to perform, but who attempts it with as much patience and calm as possible. He is like a messenger or courtier, says Jean Paul, "welcher an einem grossen Hofe die erste Audienz und zugleich das schrecklichste Bauchgrimmen hat und doch dabei ganz aufrecht bleiben muss." Or again: "Ansehnliche Glieder aus Kollegien gossen da gewöhnlich in die Dinte ihres Schreibtages einiges Abendbier, um die schwarze Farbe des Lebens zu verdünnen." De Quincey's humor is similar, but it is not the same. It can be just as whimsical and his farce is perfect in its way. But it can be bitter, and often it is no better than the smart magazine humor so common in the English Reviews (cf. for example the paper on *Schlosser's Literary History of the 18th. Century*). At its worst it depends on mere absurdity; he has no control of it; the idea seizes him and hurries him away. His best is a sustained effort in the ridiculous and impossible; for example the paper on *Murder as a Fine Art*. That love of the gruesome is not Jean Paul's humor at all.

There is plainly much that is similar in the two writers. But De Quincey preserved his originality and independence. A certain strange quality, already noticed in connection with Kant, allowed him to take the deepest interest in an author, to know him perhaps by memory, and yet, no matter how strongly moved, to turn easily from him, to his own cherished tastes. There was some-

thing mercurial in De Quincey's composition; he was rarely profoundly affected by anything from without; to that as much as to any fixed system of ideas or settled principles of criticism, he is indebted for his independent attitude.

Selections from De Quincey which may be compared with Jean Paul:

Works I, 38—50 Dream Fancies.
" " 57 ff.
" " 61—99 De Quincey's humor at its best and healthiest.
" " 178 ff.
" III, 232.
" " 343 ff.
" " 394 ff.
" " 434 ff. A description of his opium dreams.
" " 444 ff.
" " 450 ff.
" V, 16—18 Humor.
" " 384 ff. A striking example of De Quincey's rhetoric.
" VIII, 17 ff.
" XII, 158.
" XLI 9—69 Humor perfect of its kind.
" " 251—269 A good example of De Quincey's humor.
" " 270—369 Dream Fancies.

Posth. Works I, 1—27.

SCATTERED REFERENCES TO JEAN PAUL.

"Which reminds me of John Paul Richter, who suggests to some author anxiously revising the table of his own errata, that, perhaps, on reflection, he might see

cause to put the whole book into the list of *errata*; requesting of the reader kindly to erase the total work as one entire oversight and continuous blunder, from page one down to the word *finis*." Works VI, 26 f. cf. Vorrede zum *Hesperus*, J. P.'s Werke V, 13.

"The passages in which John Paul speaks of Herder are many: two in particular I remember of great beauty; one in the *Flegeljahre*, the other in his last work *Der Comet*." Works IV, 390. cf. J. P.'s Werke XX, 54; XXVIII, 142.

"Reminding one of that inscription, so justly admired by Paul Richter, which a Russian Czarina placed on a guide-post near Moscow. 'This is the road that leads to Constantinople.'" Works V, 390, note. cf. J. P.'s Werke V, 21.

Superiority of Jean Paul's style to that of most German writers. cf. Works X, 159.

Jean Paul's detection of a flaw in the plan of *Paradise Lost*. cf. Works X, 417. "'They talked', says John Paul, 'as country-people are apt to talk, concerning nothing'". cf. Works, XIV, 159.

XI. THE LUISE OF VOSS.¹

De Quincey compares the *Luise* of Voss with the *Vicar of Wakefield*. The hexameters he finds barbarous; he gives a parody of *The Parson's Dinner*. A few lines will show De Quincey's humorous exaggeration of the metre. It is a description of the training of a horse for the Austrian cavalry, the practice,

"Which still is required in the trooper who rides in the Austrian army,
... To force your horse to curvet, pirouette, dance on his haunches,
And whilst dancing to lash with his feet, and suggest an effectual hinting
To the enemy's musqueteers to clear the road for the hinter: — . . .
To practise your horse in the duty of stormy recalcitrance,
Wheeling round to present his heels, and in mid caracoling
To send the Emperor's greeting smack through the panel of oakwood."

The *Luise* according to De Quincey is an exception in German literature which he finds conspicuously lacking in work of a natural, racy and domestic growth.²

¹ Works II, 171. Other references to Voss cf. Works IV, 425 VI, 11; XI, 32; De Quincey knew Voss' *Translations of Homer*.

² Posth. Works I, 89 ff. A fragment with the title: "Anna Louisa", Specimen Translation from Voss in Hexameters, with letter to Professor W. (Christopher North.)"

XII. DE QUINCEY AND GERMAN ROMANCE.

1. WALLADMOR.

In 1824, inasmuch as no new novel of Scott's was forthcoming for the Leipsic fair, there appeared a romance¹ purporting to be a translation of Sir Walter's newest work, from sheets fresh from the Edinburgh press. The hoax was in many respects cleverly carried through, but the story was hardly one to add to Scott's reputation.

A young man named Bertram, after the shipwreck of the "Halecyon", the vessel in which he had taken passage for Wales, finds himself in a deadly struggle with a stranger for the possession of an empty cask. After gaining it, his better nature prevails and he offers to share it with his enemy. For a while they float together, swimming or resting on the cask in turn, until Bertram loses consciousness. When he comes to himself he is alone on a strange coast, the coast of Anglesey. An old witch (a recollection of Meg Merrilies) puts him on board a vessel bound for Wales. Shortly after his landing, a rough fellow joins him, leads him toward the town and shows him the way to the inn. There Bertram finds a

¹ Full Title: *Walladmor, Frei nach dem Englischen des Walter Scott, von W . . . s. Berlin, bei F. A. Herbig, 1824. 3 Bände.* This novel was the first attempt of W. Alexis (real name Häring).

motley company. The description of the guests as well as their conversation is of a dulness inconceivable. The German author, in his attempt to give the book an English cast, indulges in historical episodes, political discussions, and harangues on the subject of Reform by one Dulberry, a half-witted political dreamer. Someone announces the arrest of a certain Nichols, formerly a daring smuggler of the neighborhood, as an accomplice in the Cato-street conspiracy¹ (a most awkward attempt to give an air of reality to the piece). On learning that Nichols had been brought on the "Halcyon", Bertram relates the story of the shipwreck and his escape.

On the next day, there is a festal procession to the church. The Squire of Walladmor, after attending with his niece, returns to the townhall to hear the petitions of his people. One, a member of the company at the inn, asks for permission to bury a friend, the captain of a foreign ship. Bertram is surprised to hear the name of the captain, who had landed him on the Welsh coast. He receives a mysterious invitation to attend the burial; there he finds a crowd of smugglers, among them his friends of the inn. The procession meets the revenue officers, for the squire had received later information of the real nature of things; but they are overpowered and the smugglers gallop away to their rendezvous. Another strange note leads Bertram far into the mountains, where he finds Nichols, no other than his opponent after the shipwreck, his guide to the inn and the leader of the burial procession.

Nichols had been attracted to Bertram because of the

¹ A conspiracy organized in 1820 by Arthur Thistlewood for the murder of the ministers and the over thron of the government.

latter's generosity in offering to share the cask with him after the shipwreck: the man's character had been originally noble and aspiring, with longings for culture and refinement, and a friend to whom he could express the real nature of his soul. Such a friend he hopes to find in Bertram. Meanwhile he is in love with Miss Walladmor, whom he had saved from death; she had been carried away by the noble and generous qualities of his heart, and for some time they have been lovers. Nichols however is an outcast before the law; he had been reared in the midst of crime; he had himself been guilty at a time when he knew no higher impulses; but he was not responsible; now the sense of the cruelty of society and the injustice of the law in marking him a criminal drives him almost to frenzy; with the thought of finding justice under a new society which would recognize the real conditions of his life and his nobler aspirations, he had been led into a conspiracy against the Government. (All this rant seems to be a weak imitation of Karl von Moor.) In the midst of a harangue they are surprised. Nichols escapes, but Bertram is captured. The witch had betrayed the rendezvous; for she is the sworn foe of Nichols. Bertram is imprisoned in Walladmor Castle. He is identified as the offender (for there is a striking resemblance between them), and condemned to death; thereupon the real Nichols with characteristic magnanimity makes himself known to Squire Walladmor, and establishes the innocence of the prisoner. He rushes from the castle: meets on the way the object of his affections and implores her to follow him. She has learned however of his connection with Cato-street; her soul recoils in horror from the monster; the last tie that holds the smuggler to his better self is broken, and he leaves her swearing vengeance.

It is now necessary to explain that the Squire had condemned the son of old Gillie, the witch, as a smuggler, and so had become the object of her wrath. His wife had died at the birth of her son ; old Gillie was the only person present and she had hurriedly made away with the child. As the reader will suspect the child became the smuggler Nichols. There is a series of astounding and blood-curdling adventures, — but the sum total is that Miss Walladmor falls in love with Bertram ; that Nichols after attempting to kill him, after storming the castle and losing most of his men, comes to the conclusion that life is not worth living, surrenders himself and is condemned to die on the morrow. Another ship-load of smugglers appears ; he is rescued and again attacks the castle. In the midst of the carnage old Gillie makes the revelation that he is the Squire's son. Walladmor's sense of justice is so high that he cannot give him pardon ; but not so high as to refuse him a chance to escape — and nichols sails away to begin life anew in South America. It now appears that Lady Walladmor had born two sons ; that Bertram is the other ; that he had received an education in Germany, and had come to Wales seeking material to write an imitation of Sir Walter Scott's novels. This is discovered by no less a personage than the author of *Waverley* himself, a mysterious character who had suspected the secret designs of Bertram in his search for the picturesque.

The last bit makes it certain that the author of this tale enjoyed the hoax more than anyone else. He really seems to have made the story as impossible and ridiculous as he could. The last volume could have been written for no other purpose ; it is plainly farce, mixed with endless dissertations on Welsh mythology, English

history and politics, etc.; after the first two volumes, which are more carefully written, had insured a sale, the author let his hoaxing genius loose, and attempted to cut as many pranks as possible.

De Quincey reviewed this book in characteristic style.¹ He was forced to write his paper in 32 hours; yet he read at least enough to know the outlines of the book. The review is made up of copious quotations, a statement of its mistakes in chronology etc. and humorous advice to the hoaxter. His real trial came when he agreed to translate the book. He began his translation² in good enough spirits, hoping to finish it in three weeks; only after the printing had begun, did he realize what a task it was. "Such rubbish" he writes, "such 'almighty' nonsense, no eye has ever beheld". Before the end of the book he is disgusted thoroughly; his feelings find expression in sarcastic notes: for example, to the sentence, "A pile of books sent by the worthy baronet, restored Bertram to some degree of spirits". De Quincey adds, "Amongst which we are happy to say was the first volume of Walladmor, a novel, 2 Vols. post 8vo; the second being not then finished".

He has described his book in his best vein, not only in the preface, but in a later article written for his "*Auto-biographic Sketches*", but not published there.³ "In some instances", he says, "I let the incidents stand, and contented myself with rewriting every word of the ridic-

¹ London Magazine, Oct. 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey and not included in Masson's Edition.

² Walladmor: Freely translated into German from the English of Sir Walter Scott, and now freely translated from the German into English. In two volumes. London 1825.

³ Tait's Magazine, Sept. 1838; cf. Works XIV, 132 ff.

ulous narration, and the still more ridiculous dialogues. In others I recomposed even the incidents. In particular I was obliged to put in a new catastrophe.¹ Upon this it struck me that certain casuistical doubts might arise as to the relation which I held to my German principal; which doubts I thus expressed in a dedication to that person: — ‘Having some intention, sir, of speaking rather freely of you and your German translation in a postscript to the volume of my English one, I am shy of sending a presentation copy to Berlin. . . . Yet as books sometimes travel far, if you should ever happen to meet with mine knocking about the world in Germany, I would wish you to know that I have endeavoured to make you what amends I could for any little affront which I meditate in that postscript by dedicating my English translation to yourself. You will be surprised to observe that your three corpulent German volumes have collapsed into two English ones of rather consumptive appearance. . . . Sir John Cutler had a pair of silk stockings, which his housekeeper, Dolly, darned for a long term of years with worsted; at the end of which time the last gleam of silk had vanished and Sir John’s silk stockings were found to have degenerated into worsted. Now, upon this a question arose amongst the metaphysicians, whether Sir John’s stockings retained (or, if not, at what precise period they lost) their personal identity. . . . Some

¹ This is almost worse than the original. Miss Walladmor is reconciled to her cousin. In the midst of the love scene the noise of attack between the smugglers and the dragoons is heard; Nichols rushes out, and, just as a dragoon fires, Miss Walladmor throws herself before her lover and receives the bullet in her breast. Nichols escapes to South America and dies a noble death. De Quincey apologizes for the book in the words of the old proverb, “You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear.”

such questions will arise, I apprehend, upon your German *Walladmor*, as darned by myself. But here, my good sir, stop a moment. . . . Sir John's stockings were originally of silk, and darned with worsted. Your worsted stockings it is that I have darned with silk. . . . I have retouched the Captain and curled his whiskers. I have also taken the liberty of curing Miss Walladmor of an hysterical affliction. . . . Your geography let me tell you was none of the best; and I brushed it up myself. . . . Your chronology, by the way, was also damaged, but that has gone to the watchmaker's and is now regulated, so as to go as well as the Horse Guards. Now, finally, 'Mine deare sare' , could you not translate me back into German, and darn me as I have darned you". etc.¹

The postscript shows much more than De Quincey's usual good-natured raillery. Professor Masson's opinion, that De Quincey was a little bored by his part in the silly affair, is certainly right. His disgust appears not only in the paper written in 1838, but in the postscript itself. "In general I would request the reader to consider himself indebted to me for anything he may find particularly good; and above all things to load my unhappy 'principal' with the blame of everything that is wrong. If he comes to any passage which he is disposed to think superlatively bad, let him be assured that it is not mine. Let him take my word when I apply to the English *Walladmor* the spirit of the old bull —

'Had you seen but these roads before they were made.
You would lift up your eyes and bless Marshal Wade.' "

¹ Works XIV, 139 ff. — reprint of the original dedication.

2. DE QUINCEY AND TIECK.

De Quincey's only service to Tieck was a translation of his *Liebeszauber* under the title of *The Love Charm*, with a slight note introducing the author.¹ His characterization of Tieck sounds at this time like exaggerated praise. "There was in Tieck's early works the promise, and far more than the promise of the greatest dramatic poet whom Europe had seen since the days of Calderon . . . the uncontrollable, exuberant joyousness . . . the incarnation, so to say, of the principle of mirth, in Shakespeare and Cervantes, and Aristophanes; and, as a wreath of flowers to crown the whole, the heavenly purity and starlike loveliness of his *Genovera*."² Had illness not interfered with his productiveness, he would have been the second poet of Germany. "Goethe would have invited Tieck to sit beside him upon his throne." It is interesting to note this criticism of Goethe, written only a year after his review of *Wilhelm Meister*; but it is only a passing opinion; what De Quincey's real estimate was has already been shown. He mentions further Tieck's *Phantasus*, his novels, the prefaces to *Shakespeare's Vorschule* and *Alt-englisches Theater*.³ Tieck's criticisms on Shakespeare's dramas in the *Abend Zeitung*⁴ show that "no one was ever so able to trace out the most secret

¹ Knight's Quarterly Magazine, Extra Number 1825. Not reprinted by De Quincey; cf. Works XII, 434 ff.

² Ib. 464 f.

³ De Quincey refers also to English translations from Tieck; *The Pictures* and *The Betrothing*; the originals were *Die Gemälde*, 1821 und *Die Verlobung*, 1822. He mentions, too, a beautiful tale of magic and, in a general way, the longer novels.

⁴ Herausgegeben von Th. Hill u. Fr. Kind. Tieck's contributions are collected under the title: *Dramaturgische Blätter* etc. 1826.

workings of the great master's mind, or to retain full, calm self-possession when following him in his highest flights. No one ever united in such perfection the great critic with the great poet; one may look forward, therefore, with confidence to the greatest work in aesthetical criticism that even Germany has ever produced".¹ The remainder is an extravagant eulogy of the *Lore Charm*, its deep poetry, its power of characterization etc.

This only shows again how little De Quincey had attempted to get any final principles of criticism. It is not often that he speaks from a higher level than his own personal taste, which fortunately for his work was both by nature and cultivation, fine and strong. But it leaves his work as a whole fragmentary and unequal.

3. OTHER GERMAN STORIES.

De Quincey translated other tales from the German in the early period of his literary work, especially in the year 1823. The translations were as follows: —

a) *The Fatal Marksman*, published originally in *Popular Tales and Romances of the Northern Nations*, London 1823, Vol. III. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 286 ff. The original was *Der Freischütz*, eine Volkssage, by A. Apel. See *Gespensterbuch*, herausgegeben von A. Apel und F. Laun, Leipzig 1810—1812; I, 1 ff.

b) *Mr. Schnackenberger*, or *Two Masters for One Dog*, London Magazine, May and June 1823. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 314 ff.

c) *The Dice*, London Magazine, August 1823. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 364 ff.

¹ Works XII, 465.

d) *The King of Hayti*, London Magazine, Nov. 1823.
Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 391 ff.²

e) The *Incognito* or *Count Fitz-Hum*, Knight's Quarterly Magazine, July 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey, cf. Works XII, 417 ff. The original was by Friederich Schulze (Fr. Laun). (No complete edition of Fr. Laun's works is accessible. De Quincey knew also Laun's *Lustige Erzählungen*.)

Of these *Mr. Schnackenberger*, *The King of Hayti* and *The Incognito* are in a light vein of farce. *The Fatal Marksman* and *The Dice* are tales of mystery and witchcraft, with a tragic ending. On none of these does De Quincey make the slightest comment except on *The Incognito* by Fr. Laun. A translation of Laun's stories, says De Quincey, would be valuable "as reflecting German domestic life among the middle classes; as showing, perhaps better than any writer except Kotzebue the purely popular taste, and as having some merit in themselves as light and comic tales."⁴

These stories are of two kinds, — humorous and extravagant or mysterious and tragic, with witchcraft or some other dark agency, and perhaps a moral allegory. It is interesting to note these tastes of De Quincey in German romance, for they correspond perfectly with his own original efforts in fiction. *Murder as a Fine Art*, is his nearest approach to the first type; but in the stories of *The Household Wreck*, *The Avenger* and the

¹ The originals of these I have not been able to trace. It is possible that *Mr. Schnackenberger* at least is not a translation. De Quincey's rendering is embellished with quotations from Shakespeare, with English slang and phrases that would be more natural to an Englishman than to an German, e. g.: "A Paul Jones of a marauder"; "A Kentucky marauder".

² Works XII, 417.

novel *Klosterheim*,¹ there is the same attempt at a tragedy which passes easily into mere melodrama; there is the same use of witchcraft and mysterious agency, the same lack of originality either in scene or action. *The Avenger* and *Klosterheim* have their scenes in Germany; the first is a story told by a university professor; the second is laid in a university town in the time of the Thirty Years War. In neither, however, is there any attempt to create a really German atmosphere or German characters. They are people of no land or clime; they are mere figures for the story, with the conventional virtues and vices. The value of the stories is to be found in the narrative and the descriptive parts. It is characteristic of De Quincey to find in the *The Avenger* the old recollection of the Williams murders in London, an experience which he has described in the postscript to *Murder as a Fine Art*.

Between De Quincey's stories and German romances of the same time there is much similarity. We do not feel justified, however, in attributing to them any formative influence upon him. The same type of fiction had been in a measure the vogue in England. De Quincey had read Monk Lewis very early. But with or without any foreign influence De Quincey could have written no other kind of fiction. He had no real dramatic feeling, no sense for characterization.

¹ *Klosterheim; or the Masque*. By the English Opium-Eater. Edinburgh, London, MDCCCXXXII, cf. Works XII, 5—156. — *The Household Wreck* appeared in *Blackwood's* Jan. 1838. cf. Works XII—157 ff. — *The Avenger* appeared in *Blackwood's*. Aug. 1838. cf. Works XII—234 ff.

XIII. CONCLUSION.

It is difficult to estimate precisely the influence of De Quincey as an interpreter of German literature. It is evident that, in Edinburgh and in the Lake Circle at least, his opinions were treated with great respect. Wilson (Christopher North) writes to him (Nov. 12, 1825) in connection with some contributions to the *Quarterly*. "A noble review of Kant, would, in good time, be valuable to him and you; and, master as you are of German literature and philosophy, I do indeed hope that you may become a contributor. . . . John Paul should certainly now have justice done him."¹ Gillies, whose house was one of the literary centres of Edinburgh refers to the brilliancy of De Quincey's conversation on all subjects, among them German philosophers.² A Mr. Woodhouse, writing of conversations with De Quincey in London in 1821, shows deep reverence for his knowledge of German literature and thought.³ Mr. J. R. Findlay, who visited De Quincey in 1854, evidently looked upon his criticism of Goethe as final.⁴ It must be remembered, however, that most of

¹ Page's Life I, 271.

² Page's Life I, 190.

³ De Quincey and his Friends, 74 ff.

⁴ Ib. 144.

De Quincey's admirers were themselves ignorant of the subject. Men who were at home in German literature were not so lightly impressed. Henry Crabb Robinson, although a friend of De Quincey, never refers to his opinions. Carlyle had no respect for his judgment. It is interesting, however, to note that De Quincey first led Carlyle to read Jean Paul. "Perhaps it was little De Quincey's reported admiration of Jean Paul — Goethe a mere corrupted pygmy to him — that first put me upon trying to be orthodox and admire. I dimly felt poor De Quincey who passed for a mighty seer in such things, to have exaggerated, and to know, perhaps, but little of either Jean Paul or Goethe." De Quincey, although the two later became friends, seemed to Carlyle essentially a small man.¹

If De Quincey was of any service to the study of German literature in England, it was in the way of stimulating interest and curiosity. Even De Quincey's most friendly critics do not claim any final value for his work in this field.² Prof. Masson (*De Quincey*, p. 162) admits that the paper on Goethe (in the *Britannica*) exhibits De Quincey "at about his very worst; for, though raising the estimate of Goethe's genius that had been announced in the earlier critical paper on his *Wilhelm Meister*, it retains something of the malice of that paper". That De Quincey should have recognized the value of Kant at all is, in Prof. Masson's opinion, worthy of credit. The translation of Kant's *Idea of a Universal History* he calls a

¹ Froude, *Early Life* I, 396. See also *Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle*, Edited by J. A. Froude. 2 Vols. London 1881. II, 315 ff.

² Christoph on the other hand speaks in warm terms of De Quincey's interpretation of German literature and culture.

feat in itself. Prof. Minto writes thus:¹ "A word on his estimates of foreign writers. His exposure of weak points in such universally established names as Homer, Plato, Cicero and Goethe, is set down to no higher motive than a love of paradox, a passion for inspiring wonder. Of this every reader must judge for himself. Only when we criticise the criticisms of De Quincey, we must have in mind the unparalleled extent of his reading. This unique preparation for valuing literary powers entitles him to be criticised with reverence and modesty." Mr. Hodgson thinks it ungenerous to undervalue De Quincey's papers on Kant. "The deadness of those times to those matters was far greater than the deadness of the present time, great as that is; and in England at least I do not know of any one who did more than De Quincey to kindle a genuine interest in them." Mr. Leslie Stephen (*Fortnightly Review*, March 1871) on the other hand has no patience with De Quincey's philosophical pretensions; his criticisms of German metaphysics are, in Mr. Stephen's opinion, little better than "a collection of contemptuous prejudices". From our study of the subject we are more inclined to agree with Mr. Stephen than with Prof. Minto. De Quincey's knowledge of German literature was extensive, his interest in it was true and lasting; but he had no feeling for its deepest motives, no sense for its reality. Nor did he approach it in a spirit of true criticism; what he writes is clever; it has perhaps at times some discrimination and insight; but it is often mere opinion and facile judgment, capricious and prejudiced. Nor is it always based on knowledge; it is interesting perhaps,

¹ Manual of Prose Literature. Edinburgh and London, 1886,
p. 48.

but it is not criticism. De Quincey was not fitted by nature to interpret a new intellectual movement. His interests in literature were not deep enough, his scholarship not sufficiently earnest.¹

This paper may, however, contribute to a clearer knowledge of the talents and claims of De Quincey. He has received much blind praise and blame. A critic in the *North Brit. Review* (Aug. 1863) places him among the first fifty writers of the world. *The Quarterly* for July 1861 uses the following language: "A great master of English composition; a critic of uncommon delicacy; an honest and unflinching investigator of received opinions; a philosophic inquirer, second only to his first and sole hero: De Quincey has departed from us full of years, and left no successor to his rank. The exquisite finish of his style, with the scholastic rigour of his logic, form a combination which centuries may never reproduce, but which every generation should study as one of the marvels of English literature." Archdeacon Hare calls De Quincey "the greatest logician of our times". Even Mr. Saintsbury is full of praise for his philosophical talent. "The inability to undertake sustained labor deprived us of an English philosopher who would have stood as far above Kant in exoteric graces, as he would have stood above Bacon in esoteric value." With this opinion we cannot agree. That De Quincey had great interest in philosophical questions; that he was fond of reasoning, that he had a talent for metaphysics is one thing; but

¹ Marie Gothein, William Wordsworth, seine Werke, sein Leben, seine Zeitgenossen. Halle 1893, I, 199 ff. This writer speaks of De Quincey's "geistigem Hochmuth", his English feeling and his orthodoxy as causes which made it impossible for him to understand German literature.

to call him, in any true sense of the word, a philosopher is impossible after a study of his relation to Kant. His reason was not sufficiently independent of his desires and emotions; he was too wilful. To excuse him, as Mr. Hodgson does, on the ground that he approached such matters from the standpoint of his inherited beliefs, is natural and right; but it is only another way of saying that De Quincey's mind was not in any large sense philosophical.

Nor can we give such unlimited praise to De Quincey's critical work as many do. Mr. Hodgson writes: "No one touches and lays bare the inmost heart of a subject like De Quincey. You are not kept at the surface or delayed with commonplaces." "A clear, subtil, and penetrating intelligence is employed, not without humour in exhibiting and unfolding the essential characters of whatever subject he takes in hand. If you want any of those subjects which he has treated shown to you as in a magician's glass, its core laid bare, its relations to kindred subjects, and its bearing on human interest unfolded then take up a volume of De Quincey." "Do I then reckon on a long-lived popularity for De Quincey's writings? I certainly do. And why? To say it in one word, because of the total absence from them of the sophistry of their period." Mr. Japp in replying to the strictures of Mr. Stephen writes: "Did he ever read *Klosterheim*? Did he ever read the *Templar's Dialogues on Political Economy*? Did he ever read the article on *Casuistry*, the essay on *Milton versus Southey and Landor*, or the biographies of Goethe and Schiller from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, more especially the passage in the former dealing with Goethe's childish skepticism; and

does he hold that his criticism, here given as exhaustive, exhaustively applies to them?"¹

We confess, that we cannot understand such criticisms as these. We find on the contrary that we are kept "at the surface" and "delayed with common-places". We do not find "the core laid bare", nor the relations of a subject to human interests fully grasped. We do not find these writings free from sophistry. The biographies of Goethe and Schiller are as slight and superficial work, both in knowledge and in treatment, as one could well find in an author of De Quincey's reputation. That De Quincey had critical talent of a very high order we have no disposition to deny. His insight is often sure and clear; his tastes were for the most part sound; but he had little reserve, little balance. He says somewhere that he wrote as he thought, in a kind of audible soliloquy. This may be true; but it is not the method of a critic of the first rank. In these papers on German literature there is little that has weight; much of it is personal and irresponsible. Henry Crabb Robinson says in his diary (II, 216): "All that De Quincey writes, is curious, if not valuable." That is as high praise as De Quincey's criticism of German literature deserves.

On the other hand there is no reason to dismiss De Quincey's work contemptuously as a writer in the *Athenaeum* does (Dec. 17, 1859): "Death has brought a close to the sad and almost profitless career of the English Opium-Eater. Of all his writings, and all of them are steeped in egotism, 'The Confessions' are the most characteristic. In their elegance of diction, playfulness of style, subdued pedantry and utter shamelessness, the

¹ Page's Life II, 150.

entire man is made known to the reader." Mr. Leslie Stephen closes his paper in a similar way: "In a life of seventy three years, De Quincey read extensively, and thought acutely by fits, ate an enormous quantity of opium, wrote a few pages which revealed new capacities in the language, and provided a good deal of respectable padding for magazines."¹ Brandl speaks of De Quincey as an "Essayist, Opiumesser und mehr interessanter als verlässlicher Memoirenschreiber, ein hoch begabter Träumer."² It is difficult to deny that there is truth in such criticisms. As applied to much of De Quincey's work there is nothing else to be said. But after all deductions are made there is something in him that is true and original; De Quincey is a writer; at his best, a writer of the first rank; it is as a master of language, of the prose of passion and fancy, that De Quincey deserves a place in English literature. If literature as a thing in itself has any claim to our attention, the De Quincey of the *Confessions*, the De Quincey of the *Suspiria* is worthy of the highest respect.

¹ Mr. Japp quotes the article by Mr. Stephen (Page's Life II, 146) from the *Westminster Review* for April 1854. It occurs in the *Fortnightly* for March 1871. As a whole Mr. Stephen's paper, hard as it is, is the truest estimate of De Quincey that we have read, excepting perhaps the final chapter of Prof. Masson's *De Quincey*.

² Brandl, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge und die englische Romantik*. Berlin 1886, S. 313.

APPENDIX I.

LIST OF DE QUINCEY'S CONTRIBUTIONS ON GERMAN LITERATURE.

John Paul Frederic Richter, with Analects: The Happy Life of a Parish Priest in Sweden; Last Will and Testament — The House of Weeping. *London Magazine*, Dec. 1821. Reprinted by De Quincey with the exception of the second analect. cf. Works XI, 259 ff.

Death of a German Great Man. *London Magazine*, April 1823. Reprinted by De Quincey under the title *Herder*. cf. Works IV, 380 ff.

Mr. Schnackenberger: or Two Masters for One Dog (from the German). *London Magazine*, May, June 1823. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 314 ff.

The Dice (from the German). *London Magazine*, Aug. 1823. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 364 ff.

The King of Hayti (from the German). *London Magazine*, Nov. 1823. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 391 ff.

The Fatal Marksman (from the German). *In Popular Tales and Romances of the Northern Nations*. London 1823. Vol. III. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 286 ff.

Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Rosicrucians and Free-Masons (A Digest from the German). *London Magazine*, Jan., Feb., March and June 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XIII, 384 ff.

Analects from John Paul Richter: Complaint of the Bird in a Darkened Cage; cf. Jean Paul's *Werke* (Berlin 1840—42) XXVIII, 123; On the Death of Young Children; ib. XXVIII, 125; The Prophetic Dew-Drops; ib. XXVIII, 140; On Death; Imagination untamed by the Coarser Realities of Life; ib. XI, 218; Satirical Notice of Reviewers; ib. XI, 183; Female Tongues; ib. XI, 214; Forgiveness; ib. VII, 150; Nameless Heroes; ib. XI, 167; The Grandeur of Man in His Littleness; ib. VII, 241; Night; ib. VIII, 49; The Stars; ib. VIII, 50; Martyrdom; ib. VIII, 94; The Quarrels of Friends; Dreaming; Two Divisions of Philosophic Minds; ib. XIII, 310; Dignity of Man in Self-Sacrifice; ib. VII, 152; Fancy*; ib. VII, 187; Innate Feeling and Acquisition*; ib. XVII, 94; Use of Opposites*; Deafness*.¹ ib. XV, 168, Anmerkung. *London Magazine*, Feb. 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey with the exception of the last four. cf. Works XI, 273 ff.

Dream Upon The Universe, by John Paul Richter. *London Magazine*, March 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey with the other *Analects* from Richter. cf. Works XI, 290 ff.

Kant on National Character in Relation to the Sense of the Sublime and Beautiful. A translation. *London Magazine*, April 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XIV, 46 ff.

Abstract of Swedenborgianism by Immanuel Kant. *London Magazine*, May 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XIV, 61 ff.

Goethe as Reflected in his Novel of Wilhelm Meister (review of Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meister*) *London Magazine*, Aug., Sept. 1824. The second article reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XI, 222 ff. (First paper omitted).

The Incognito, or Count Fitz Hum. Knight's Quarterly Magazine, July 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 417 ff.

Walladmor; *Sir Walter Scott's German Novel*. *London Magazine*, Oct. 1824. Not reprinted by De Quincey and not included in Masson's Edition.

Walladmor, "Freely translated into German from the

¹ Those marked (*) are titles assigned by Prof. Masson.

English of Sir Walter Scott", and now freely translated from the German into English. London 1825, 2 vols.

Idea of a Universal History on a Cosmo-Political Plan. By Immanuel Kant. *London Magazine*, Oct. 1824. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works IX, 428.

The Love Charm (from the German of Tieck). *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*, Extra Number 1825. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XII, 434 ff.

Lessing; with a translation from his Laocoön. *Blackwood's Magazine*, Nov. 1826, Jan. 1827. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XI, 156 ff.

The Last Days of Immanuel Kant. *Blackwood's Magazine*, Feb. 1827. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works IV, 323 ff.

Toilette of the Hebrew Lady. (A digest from the German.) Original: Hartmann, *Die Hebräerin am Putztische und als Braut*, Amsterdam 1809. *Blackwood's Magazine*, March 1828. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works VI, 152 ff.

Kant in his Miscellaneous Essays. *Blackwood's Magazine*, Aug. 1830. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works VIII, 84 ff.

Kant on the Age of the Earth. *Tait's Magazine*, Nov. 1833. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XIV, 69 ff.

German Studies and Kant in Particular. Part of the *Autobiographic Sketches*. *Tait's Magazine*, June 1836. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works II, 81 ff. Also in *Uncollected Writings* under the title: *The German Language and the Philosophy of Kant*. I, 91 ff.

Life of Goethe (1837 or earlier). *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works IV, 395 ff.

Life of Schiller, 1838. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works IV, 422 ff.

Walladmor, A Pseudo-Waverley Novel, *Tait's Magazine*, Sept. 1838. An Article in the *Autobiographic Sketches*. Not reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XIV, 132 ff.

Schlosser's Literary History of the Eighteenth Century. Review of Fr. Chr. Schlosser's *History of the Eighteenth Century and of the Nineteenth till the overthrow of the French*

Empire, with particular reference to Mental Cultivation and Progress. Translated with a preface and notes by D. Davidson, London 1843—52. The review deals only with what concerns English literature. The original was *Geschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts und des neunzehnten bis zum Sturz des französischen Kaiserreichs. Tait's Magazine*, Sept., Oct. 1847. Reprinted by De Quincey. cf. Works XI, 5 ff.

Anna Louisa. Specimen Translation from Voss in Hexameters, with Letter to Professor W. (Christopher North.) Posth. Works I, 89 ff.

Theory and Practice; Review of Kant's Essay on the Common Saying that such and such a thing may be true in theory, but does not hold good in practice. Posth. Works II, 182 ff.

APPENDIX II.

Apart from De Quincey's criticisms on German literature, the following references will show how extended his studies were. De Quincey rarely quotes book and page; often he mentions a book without the author or vice versa. In many cases he gives no clue whatever. It is probable that De Quincey did not always know at first hand the works or authors mentioned, for many of them had been reviewed in English magazines. References marked (?) are doubtful.

HISTORY.

Bobrik, Hermann (1814—1845), *Geographie des Herodot.* 1838. cf. Works VI, 100.

Böckh, Philipp Aug. (1785—1867), *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener.* 2 Bde., 1817. A second edition with a third volume added, 1851. cf. Works I, 180, note; VI, 60; Posth. Works I, 259.

Böttger or Böttiger, Karl Aug. (1760—1835), *Sabina, oder Morgenszenen im Putzzimmer einer reichen Römerin.* Neue Aufl. 1806. Originally in the *Journal für Moden.* cf. Works VI, 152, 156, 174. The last reference makes it probable that De Quincey knew this journal.

von Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph (1774-1836), *Geschichte der Assassinen,* 1818.

Hartmann, Anton Theo. (1774—1838), *Die Hebräerin am Putztische und als Braut* Theile I—III, 1809—1810. De

Quincey gives a digest of the book. cf. Works VI, 152 ff. (See also Appendix I). De Quincey mentions (Works III, 293, note) a German work on Hebrew antiquities; perhaps the above is meant.

Lepsius, Karl Richard (1810—1884). cf. Works VII, 252.

Lipsius, Justus (1547—1606). *De amphitheatro* 1584. cf. Works I, 180, note. *Admiranda, sive, de magnitudine Romana.* 1599. cf. p. 110 of this work and remarks of De Quincey's, Works I, 179, note; VI, 226, note; Posth. Works I, 147.

Müller, Karl Otfried (1797—1840). cf. Works VII, 45, 252; XI, 440, note. *Geschichten hellenischer Stämme und Städte.* Erster Band: *Orchomenos und die Minyer.* 1820. cf. Works VI, 105; Posth. Works I, 273. *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie,* 1825. cf. Works I, 372.

Niebuhr, Barthold Georg (1776—1831). cf. Works VI, 256; VII, 45, 252; VIII, 98.

Niebuhr, Karsten (1733—1815). cf. Works VI, 155; it is probable that De Quincey knew *Beschreibung von Arabien,* 1772, or *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und andern umliegenden Ländern,* 1774—1778.

Savigny, Fr. Karl von (1779—1861). cf. Works VII, 45.

German claims in the field of ancient history. cf. Works VII, 45.

Quotation of a foreign writer's (probably a German's) comment on a remark by Agrippina, *occidat dum imperet* — expressing her ambition for Nero. cf. Works VI, 355. The remark is given by Cassius Dio 61, 13 and by Tacitus in the *Annalen* IV, 9.

German writers upon Charlemagne, cf. Works, V, 377.

A German writer who considers the Roman office of the praetorian prefect as best represented to modern ideas by the Turkish post of grand vizier. cf. Works VI, 370.

A German writer's comment on Trajan's treatment of the Dacians. cf. Works VI, 384.

A reference to a foreign writer "who calls Diocletian one of the greatest of men if not the greatest". cf. Works VI, 409.

(These four references all occur in the paper on *The Caesars*, written in 1832. Schlosser's *Universal-historische Uebersicht* is the only German work of importance before that time which deals with the Caesars. A possible germ for De Quincey's remarks concerning Trajan, quoted, he says, from the German, is found in Schlosser. De Quincey quoted probably from memory; but, in any case, the similarity with Schlosser's remark is so slight that it is probable he refers to some other work. Of the other originals I can find no trace.)

A German author who notices "the coincidence between the augury derived from the flight of the twelve vultures as types of the duration of the Roman empire, i. e. western empire for twelve centuries and the actual event". cf. Works X, 429 and Niebuhr's *Römische Geschichte*. Herausgegeben von M. Isler, Berlin 1873. 3 Bände, I, 184.

German writers on Charlemagne. cf. Works V, 377.

CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP.

Abeken, Bernhard Rudolf (1780—1866). *Cicero in seinen Briefen*, 1835. cf. Works VI, 186, 190 f.

Adelung, Joh. Chr. (1732—1806). *Mithridates*, 1806. cf. Works X, 33, 362. De Quincey refers here to the *Mithridates* and "other works of the same kind".

Ernesti, Joh. Chr. Gottlieb (1756—1802). De Quincey (X, 254, note) writes: "The vocabulary of aesthetic terms, after all the labors of Ernesti and other German editors, is still far from being understood". This seems to point to *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*, 1795, or to *Lexicon technologiae Romanorum rhetoricae*, 1797.

Heyne, Chr. Gottlob (1729—1812). A poor opinion of Heyne's *Vergil*, 1767—75. cf. Works V, 140. Other references to Heyne, III, 15; V, 85 f.; VI, 38.

Kuster, Ludolf (1670—1716). cf. Works IV, 181, 185.

Lobeck, Chr. Aug. (1781—1860), *Aglaophamus, sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis*, 1829. cf. Works I, 372; VII, 199.

Reiske, Joh. Jacob (1716—1774), *Oratores graeci*, 1770—1775. De Quincey (V, 97) calls him a hasty and careless but copious scholar, and agrees with his stringent criticism of English Latinity. See Reiske's Edition of *Demosthenes*. Londini 1822—23. I, XLIV.

Ruhnken, David (1723—1798). De Quincey names him (VIII, 92) “the admirable Ruhnken”. Other references, Works IV, 181, 327.

Schutz, Chr. Gottfried (1747—1832); De Quincey refers (Page's Life I, 158) to Schutz' edition of *Aeschylus*, 1782—94, and to “*Cicero's Rhetorical Writings*”, 1804—08.

Vater, Johann Severin (1771—1826). *Mithridates oder Allgemeine Sprachkunde etc.* Bände 2—4, 1809—17. cf. Works X, 33, 362, note.

Volgraff, J. C. Edition of *Pro Caelio*. Posth. Works I, 193.

Wettstein, Joh. Jacob (1693—1754). cf. Works IV, 188, note. De Quincey refers (IV, 190) to Wettstein's *Prolegomena*; probably this is *Prolegomena ad N. Ti. graece editionem*, 1732.

ON THE HOMERIC QUESTION.

See especially De Quincey's paper on *Homer and the Homericadae*. Works VI, 7 ff.

Herder. De Quincey says of Herder's opinions on the Homeric Question: “Not so much by learning as by the sagacity of his genius, he threw out some pregnant hints of the disputed points” (VI, 15). cf. Herder's *Beiträge zu den Horen*, 1795, 1796, in *Herder's sämmtlichen Werken*, 1877—1899; 32 Bände. Band XVIII, S. 420 ff.

Heyne, Chr. Gottlob. De Quincey (Works IV, 193) refers to Heyne's Edition of Homer. See also V, 85. f; VI, 38.

Ilgen, Karl David (1763—1834), *Hymni Homerici*, 1796. cf. Works VI, 30 f.

Müller, Wilh. (1794—1827), *Homerische Vorschule* 1824 (?). cf. Works VI, 44 f. This is the only work of Müller's which seems to correspond to De Quincey's reference.

Nitzsch, Gregor Wilh. (1790—1861). The article on the

Odyssee in *Die Eneyklopädie* von Ersch und Gruber, III, 1, S. 384 ff. De Quincey (VI, 16) acknowledges himself indebted to Nitzsch for the material of his paper on *Homer and the Homericidae*, and speaks of various articles contributed by Nitzsch to the *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*. The above paper was Nitzsch's only contribution however. cf. D. Fr. Lübker, *Gregor Wilhelm Nitzsch in seinem Leben und Wirken*. Jena 1864. S. 192. A catalogue of Nitzsch's writings is given there.

Voss, Joh. Heinrich (1751—1826). De Quincey knew at least in part the translations from Homer (*Odyssee*, 1781. *Homer's Werke*, *Hlias* new, *Odyssee* revised 1793). cf. Works VI, 11. He mentions in the same connection Voss's letters to Wolff expressing his opinion of the Homeric question. cf. *Briefe von Johann Heinrich Voss nebst erläuternden Beilagen*, herausgegeben von Abraham Voss. Halberstadt 1830. 3 Bände. 2. Band, S. 239. Other references to Voss on the Homeric Question, VI, 68.

Wolf, Fr. Aug. (1759—1824). *Prolegomena ad Homerum*, 1795. *Briefe an Herrn Hofrath Heyne*, 1797. cf. Works VI, 10 ff.

THEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Eichhorn, Joh. Gottfried (1752—1827). *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1780—83. cf. Works II, 201; VII, 74.

Griesbach, Joh. Jacob (1745—1812). cf. Works VIII, 271, 273.

Michaelis, Joh. David (1717—1791). cf. Works II, 201.

Strauss, David Fr. (1808—1874). De Quincey had the intention to translate Strauss, (probably *Das Leben Jesu*, 1835), but could not find a publisher. cf. De Quincey and his Friends p. 155. Other references to Strauss: Works I, 42, note; Posth. Works II, 225, note.

German views on the act of Judas Iscariot. cf. Works VIII, 177, 184.

“German infidels” in Old Testament criticism. cf. Works VIII, 287, note.

Christ a suicide, attempt of a Prussian or Saxon baron to prove. cf. Works VIII, 336.

PHILOSOPHY.

Basedow, Joh. Bernhard (1723—1790). De Quincey (Works XIV, 45) refers to him as the one who introduced Rousseau into Germany, speaks of his services in the science of Pedagogy and adds, “He had a silly ambition of being reputed an infidel”.

Böhme, Jacob (1575—1624). cf. Works V, 183, note. De Quincey presented Coleridge with a set of Böhme’s works.

Bouterwek, Fr. (1766—1828). cf. Works X, 41 ff. De Quincey knew probably *Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*. 1801—1807.

Brucker, Joh. Jacob (1696—1770). *Historia critica philosophiae* etc. 1742—44. cf. Works X, 66. The above is certainly the work referred to.

Buhle, Joh. Gottlieb Gerh. (1763—1821). cf. Works VII, 201. De Quincey refers to Buhle’s edition of *Aristotle*, 1791—1804, and his *History of Philosophy*; the latter is certainly *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie und einer kritischen Litteratur derselben*, 1796—1804. De Quincey drew his material for the *Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Rosicrusians and Free-Masons* (See Appendix I, p. 120) from Buhle’s *Ueber den Ursprung und die Schicksale des Ordens der Rosenkreuzer und Freimaurer*, 1804.

Darjes, Joachim Georg (1714—1791). De Quincey (VIII, 140, note) speaks of him and “other followers of Wolff”.

Fichte (1762—1814). cf. Works II, 146; III, 397; X, 429 f. a quotation from Fichte’s *Ueber den Begriff des wahrhaften Krieges*. cf. Fichte’s Werke, Berlin 1845, Band IV, S. 401 ff. De Quincey quotes from memory and not exactly.

Hegel (1770—1831.) cf. Works XII, 464. De Quincey calls Hegel “the great master of the impenetrable”, and refers to the poor commentaries on his works.

Lambert, Joh. Heinrich (1728—1777). cf. Works IV, 430; V, 339; Posth. Works II, 62.

Leibnitz (1646—1714). cf. Works IV, 423; X, 16 ff.; XI, 157; Posth. Works II, 228. De Quincey seems to have read Leibnitz carefully. He mentions Leibnitz' *Letters* (Edited by Feder, Hannover 1815), (cf. Works V, 95), and the *Theodicee*, 1710. cf. Works II, 170; V, 344; X, 214. There are also the following references to Leibnitz:

His criticism of Locke. ib. II, 94.

His use of the word “apperception”; ib. II, 203; X, 75, note.

His idea of a philosophical language; ib. III, 250, note.

His recognition of Lord Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*; ib. IV, 27, note.

His explanation of the old puzzle of Achilles and the tortoise; ib. V, 332, 348, note.

Erdmann's edition of Leibnitz' Works; ib. V, 349.

His remark that no two leaves, even from the same tree, could be duplicates; ib. V, 357, note.

His use of the phrase “sufficient reason”; ib. VI, 99.

His distinction between *ratio cognoscendi* and *ratio essendi*; ib. VIII, 58.

His fine philosophic style; ib. VIII, 92.

His *principium indiscernibilium*; ib. X, 129.

Mendelsohn, Moses (1729—1786). *Phädon, oder über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*, 1767. De Quincey (X, 384) speaks slightly of Mendelsohn and his popularity in Germany. De Quincey refers (II, 155,) to Kant as “der alles zermalmende”, “a remark made by one who weighed him well”. This epithet was first applied by Mendelsohn: *Vorrede zu den Morgenstunden*, 1785.

Schelling (1775—1854). cf. Works III, 397; VIII, 128; XI, 50; Posth. Works II, 16, 32. De Quincey refers (II, 145 f. and note) to Schelling's *Kleine philosophische Werke*. This is probably Schelling's *Philosophische Schriften*, 1809. A reference in the same connection to Coleridge's indebtedness to Schelling

makes it clear that De Quincey had read *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*. De Quincey speaks of an essay in the *Biographia Literaria* as “prefaced by a few words”, in which Coleridge explains his obligations to Schelling, but insists that he had developed the same ideas independently. “What was my astonishment”, writes De Quincey, “to find that the entire essay, from the first word to the last, is a verbatim translation from Schelling”. Coleridge’s statement really stands in another section of the *Biographia Literaria*. The original which De Quincey mentions as found in *Philosophische Schriften* is really in *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*. The whole is not verbatim, but parts of it are. cf. Coleridge’s Works, 7 vols, New York 1884. Vol. III, 332 ff. (foot-notes).

De Quincey describes (XI, 50) Fr. Schlegel’s claims as a philosopher as demolished by a foot-note of Schelling’s. There are foot-notes referring to Schlegel in *Ueber das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, and *Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen* etc. But none of them justify De Quincey’s remark.

Schleiermacher (1768—1834). cf. Works XII, 464.

Steffens, Heinrich (1773—1845). Ib.

Tennemann, Wilhelm Gottlieb (1761—1819). cf. Works X, 185.

Tiedemann, Dietrich (1748—1803). *Geist der speculativen Philosophie* (1791—97). cf. Works IV, 380, note; X, 185.

Wolf, Christian von (1679—1754). cf. Works X, 75 f., note; XI, 157.

German philosophers on the Lisbon earthquake. cf. Posth. Works II, 134, note.

A German philosophers remark that the catechism of the English church is the most metaphysical of books. cf. Works IX, 148.

LITERARY REFERENCES.

Arndt, Ernst Moritz (1769—1860). *Erinnerungen aus dem äusseren Leben*, 1840. That De Quincey knew this book is

proved by a quotation; cf. Posth. Works I, 223 f. and the third edition of Arndt's work (Leipzig 1842), p. 170. Posth. Works II, 209; Arndt's opinion of the French military disposition.

Brun, Friederike (1765—1835). cf. Works II, 143; Posth. Works II, 32.

Bodmer, Joh. Jacob (1698—1783). cf. Works II, 172; IV, 426; X, 43, note; XI, 27.

Bürger, Gottfried August (1747—1794). IV, 428.

Fouqué, Fr. Heinrich Karl de la Motte (1777—1843). *Undine* (1811). cf. De Quincey and his Friends, p. 146, note.

Gottsched, Joh. Christoph (1700—1766). cf. Works II, 172; IV, 424, 426 f.; X, 45, note; XI, 27.

Hamann, Joh. Georg (1730—1788). cf. Works III, 333; V, 218. Harmann in the second reference is probably wrongly written for Hamann.

Hippel, Theodor Gottlieb (1741—1796). cf. Works III, 333; V, 218.

Hölty, Ludwig Heinrich Christoph (1748—1776). cf. Works II, 228.

Jacobi, Fr. Heinrich (1743—1819). cf. Works X, 122.

Klopstock, Fr. Gottlieb (1724—1803). cf. Works II, 170 ff.; IV, 383., 426 ff.

Kotzebue, August Friedrich Ferdinand v. (1761—1819). cf. Works XII, 417.

Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph (1742—1799). cf. Works IV, 428; X, 159.

Matthison, Friedrich von (1761—1831). cf. Posth. Works II, 32.

Novalis (Friedrich Leopold von Hardenberg, 1772—1801). cf. Works VIII, 346, 410, note; XII, 464. De Quincey refers to some speculations by Novalis on the forms of the constellations; to the idea of Novalis "that certain modes of ill health are prerequisites towards certain modes of intellectual development".

Opitz, Martin (1597—1639). cf. Works IV, 423; X, 256, note.

Schlegel, Friedrich von (1772—1829) and A. W. von Schlegel (1767—1845). The latter is not separately mentioned,

although De Quincey refers to “the Schlegels”. Works II, 74; X, 41 ff.; XI, 50; XI, 60; Blackwood’s XXVIII, 248.

ib. II, 83; X, 122; Schlegel’s praise of Kant’s style.

ib. II, 88; Schlegel on Kant’s terminology. cf. Fr. Schlegel’s *Werke*. 12 Bände, Wien, 1822—23, Band II, S. 304.

ib. IV, 416; The Schlegel’s “Commentary” on *Wilhelm Meister*. cf. Fr. Schlegel, *Ueber Goethe’s Meister* in the *Athenäum*, 3 Bände, Berlin 1798—1800, I, 147 ff.; *Charakteristik des Wilhelm Meister* in *Charakteristiken und Kritiken* von A. W. Schlegel und Fr. Schlegel. 1801, Id.; *Charakteristik der Meisterschen Lehrjahre von Goethe*, 1798. Fr. Schlegel’s *Werke* X, 123 ff.

ib. IV, 417; Schlegel’s opinion of Goethe’s *Iphigenie*; that it is “a mere echo of the old Grecian music”. cf. A. W. Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur* III, S. 405 f.

ib. IV, 428. The depreciation of Wieland by the Schlegels, “when old age had laid a freezing hand upon his energy”. cf. *Athenäum*; 1799, 331, 340.

ib. X, 122; Fr. Schlegel’s opinion that the prose of his own country was lacking in the sense of style.

ib. X, 127; Schlegel’s praise of French diction.

ib. XI, 160; Schlegel’s introduction to *Lessings Geist aus seinen Schriften*, etc.

ib. XI, 163; Schlegel’s remark (originally Kant’s) that merely to fix the boundaries of the different sciences is a great positive advance.

ib. X, 350; Schlegel’s idea of fate in the Greek tragedy; cf. A. W. Schlegel, *Ueber dramatische Kunst und Litteratur*; 2. Ausgabe, 1817. Erster Theil, S. 107 f.

ib. II, 74; Schlegel’s distinction between Romantic and Classical Literature. cf. A. W. Schlegel, *Ueber dramatische Kunst und Litteratur* I, 13 ff.; III, 14 ff.; De Quincey’s comparison of Greek and English tragedy (see p. 14) may have been suggested by this passage from Schlegel. He compares the antique tragedy to sculpture, the modern to painting.

Wieland, Christoph Martin (1733—1813); cf. Works. IV, 383, 389, 428; XI, 18 f., 342. De Quincey refers (V, 191) to Sotheby, the translator of *Oberon*; but there is nothing to show that De Quincey knew Sotheby's translation.

UNCLASSIFIED AUTHORS AND WORKS.

Bergmann, Benj. von. *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmücken*,¹ 1804—5. cf. Works VI, 88; VIII, 343; X, 249; XI, 392, note; Posth. Works I, 443.

Blumenbach, Joh. Fr. (1752—1840). cf. Works II, 168.

Bunsen, Chr. Karl Josias von (1791—1860). *Die Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft*, 1845. cf. Works VIII, 259.

Carus, Karl Gustav (1789—1869). cf. Works XI, 10.

Euler, Leonhard (1707—1783). cf. Works IV, 430; Posth. Works II, 62.

Frantzius. cf. Works V, 363.

Haller, Albrecht von (1708—1777). cf. Works IV, 431.

Heinze. cf. Works X, 258. "Some thirty years ago the Prussian government was said to have introduced into the public service a dictionary which rejected all words not purely vernacular". Then in a note: "By Heinze, if I recollect, and founded partly on that of Wolff".

Humboldt, A. von (1769—1859). cf. Works VI, 108.

Humboldt, W. von (1767—1835). cf. Works IV, 416; X, 284.

Jacobs. A book on English literature, published, says De Quincey, in Hamburg. cf. Works X, 47, note.

Kepler. cf. Works IV, 422.

Kohl, Joh. Georg (1808—1878). cf. Works XI, 10.

Körte, Fr. Heinrich Wilhelm (1776—1846). *Leben und Studien Fr. Aug. Wolf's*, 1833. cf. Works VI, 10.

Luther. cf. Works IV, 422.

¹ De Quincey drew most of his material for the paper *Flight of the Tartars* from this work.

Melanchthon. cf. Works VI, 236, XI, 413; De Quincey refers to Melanchthon's *Sketch of Universal History*. This is not to be found in the catalogue of Melanchthon's writings. cf. Hartfelder, *Melanchthon*, in *Monumenta Germaniae pädagogica*. Berlin 1889, p. 579 ff.

Menzel, Wolfgang (1798—1873). De Quincey quotes (Works II, 85); "Ten thousand new books, we are assured by Menzel, an author of high reputation, is considerably below the number annually poured from all quarters of Germany into the vast reservoir of Leipsic". This was written in 1836. cf. Menzel, *Die deutsche Litteratur*, 2. Auflage, Stuttgart 1836, I, 32. Menzel speaks here of 6000 books published in Germany, in 1832.

Möser, Justus (1720—1794). *Patriotische Phantasien*, 1774. cf. Works IV, 412.

Raumer, Fr. Lud. Georg von (?) (1781—1873). cf. Works XI, 10 ff. De Quincey writes (VII, 360, note): "Many things, which the wretched von Raumer said of English art, were abominable and malicious falsehoods".

Riedesel, Friederika (?) (1746—1808). "A remark by a German traveler (Riedesel, I think) on the origin of the word 'blue-stocking'." cf. Works XI, 458.

Ringelberg, Joachim Forz. *De Ratione Studii*, 1622. cf. Works X, 26, note.

Spittler, Ludwig Timotheus von (1752—1810). *Entwurf der Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*. 1793—94. cf. Works I, 343. The above is certainly meant. cf. 3. Auflage. Berlin 1823. 2. Band, S. 311.

Weikard, Melchior Adam (1742—1803). cf. Works IV, 342.

Weishaupt, Adam (1748—1830). cf. Works IV, 241, note. A German translation of Calderon. cf. Works X, 37.

Die Abendzeitung. cf. XII, 465. *Die Abendzeitung* appeared in 1824 and was continued till 1838.

GENERAL REFERENCES.

• Everlasting Jew, German imagination in the story of the. cf. Works VII, 27, note.

Germans, the “least accurate and wide awake of peoples”. cf. Works IV, 385, note.

German book, A, of which it was said, “es lässt sich nicht lesen”, so poor was the style. cf. Works X, 167.

German Literature, its influence upon the English. cf. Works XI, 143, note.

German literature, Romance in. cf. Works VII, 351.

Knecht Rupert and the Christmas custom. cf. Works XII, 340, note. De Quincey had read of Knecht Rupert in *The Friend*.

Love of Children in Germany; consequent interest in Pedagogy. cf. Works XIV, 45.

Shakespeare scholarship in Germany. cf. Works IV, 84; XI, 50; a very slighting reference.

Scholarship, Heaviness of German. cf. Works XI, 43.

Travel, Little, done by the Germans. cf. Works VII, 352.

Universities, Vice in German, in Geethe's Time. cf. Works IV, 419.

Universities, Freedom of thought in German, deplored. cf. Works V, 298 ff. *a*



LEBENSLAUF.

Ich, William A. Dunn bin am 10. September 1873 zu Scroggsfield, Ohio, U. S. A: geboren als Sohn des Pfarrers W. C. Dunn. Mit vierzehn Jahren besuchte ich die Schule und später das College in Wooster, Ohio. Die Jahre 1891—93 verbrachte ich in Princeton, N. J. auf dem dortigen College, wo ich im Jahr 1893 den Grad eines "Bachelor of Arts" und ein Jahr später den Titel eines "Master of Arts" erwarb. Während der Jahre 1894—96 war ich in Princeton College angestellt als Hilfslehrer in der Abtheilung für den englischen Unterricht. Das nächste Jahr war ich Lehrer an einer Knabenschule, Hill School, Pottstown, Penn., wo ich Aufsätze und Litteraturunterricht hatte. Um mich weiteren Studien zu widmen, ging ich im Jahre 1897 nach Deutschland und bezog die Strassburger Universität, wo ich die Vorlesungen von den Herren Professoren Henning, Koeppel, Windelband und Ziegler gehörte, und an den Seminaren von den Herren Professoren Henning, Koeppel, Martin und Ziegler theilgenommen habe. Ich möchte nicht versäumen, den genannten Herren an dieser Stelle meinen Dank auszusprechen für die Förderung, die sie mir in meinen Studien zu Theil werden liessen.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library

or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ED

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing
books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made
4 days prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

DEC 06 2005

5

72 30

72

DD20 12M 1-05

99688

